THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 1. APRIL, 1930. Vol. XX.

ANGLO-CATHOLIC AND ROMAN CATHOLIC

By the Rev. Francis Underhill, M.A., Warden of Liddon House.

THE March number of the *Modern Churchman* included in its editorial pages a courteous critique of my small book, *The New Spirit in Anglo-Catholicism*, and founded upon an estimate of the present position and prospects of the Catholic Revival in the Church of England. The salient points of the estimate may be represented by four quotations from the editorial.

'Fr. Underhill's effort is prompted by a realization of the great dangers we are in by our unhappy divisions, and also by the realization that . . . the Anglo-Catholic Movement . . . is not going to succeed in winning the English nation to its ideals, even though it may have gained a temporary ascendancy within the Church.'

'It has generally been believed that its final objective was to bring the Church of England under the domination of the Pope—in short, undo the work of the Reformation.'

'If the movement had only been satisfied to stand uncompromisingly for liberal and reformed Catholicism, and had set its face firmly against the fictions of mediaeval and modern Romanism, it would have won the gratitude of the English Church as a whole . . . '

'Fr. Underhill's book is significant; it would, however, be strengthened if he met the charge of Romanizing more strongly, and indicated where Anglo-Catholics draw the line between Catholicism and Romanism. Is Rome their ultimate objective?'

I will comment briefly on these sentences.

(1) Romanizing.

The Catholic Revival has throughout been dogged by the accusation of Romanizing. Whatever truth there may have been or is in the charge, all fair-minded persons who know the facts must admit that it has been in very many instances founded upon ignorant prejudice. The aim of the Tractarians was beyond doubt a reformed, if not a liberal Catholicism. Their hatred of Rome was if anything exaggerated; they never ceased to proclaim that not Rome, but the reclaiming of doctrines and practices which were clearly part of the tradition of the English Church, was their objective. But they were never believed either by the nation or by the great body of the Church of England itself. Trivial matters such as the wearing of the surplice in the pulpit or the placing of a cross on the altar, were considered to be part of a plot to undo the Reformation. No attempt has been made until very lately by opponents to distinguish between real and avowed Romanizing on the one side, and on the other the effort to stand for 'liberal and reformed Catholicism'.

The matter might not have been so disastrous if alternate neglect and attack had been the attitude merely of the general public. The real trouble, which is still very far from being set right, has been the astonishing inability of the authorities of the Church of England to harness and use the admitted force of the movement. To this very day Anglo-Catholicism exists on sufferance in most dioceses; here and there an individual may be given a place in the diocesan life, but generally it is regarded as unsafe to trust at all a full-blooded Anglo-Catholic, however 'loyal' he may be, in a post of any responsibility. The movement has never been allowed to pull its weight in the Church.

Why? What is the reason of this suspicion of Anglo-Catholicism both by the nation and the Church? There is no doubt that the *Modern Churchman* is right in saying that 'it has generally been believed that its final objective was to bring the Church of England under the domination of the Pope.'

(2) Why is Rome Feared?

But that in itself is no answer. What is the popular objection to bringing the Church of England again under the domination

Pope? I suppose it is that this Church and nation have for cenies been haunted by terrible memories going centuries back. w historical events are burnt into the consciousness of the glish like the fires of Smithfield, the evil lives of some of the pes, the Spanish Armada, the series of 'Popish plots' of the gns of Elizabeth and James I. Most men and women, if they ught of it, would realize the impossibility of repeating the rors of the past, even if a modern Pope should dream of poli- l domination in this country. Yet there is deep-set in the glishman's mind a hatred and suspicion of the political activi- which he would sum up in the word 'Jesuitry.' All this may perfectly unreasonable. The reported intrigues of Irish and er priests may be of the nature of bogies. Yet whatever be e or untrue, you have only to dub a man a Romanizer, a ser- e or a method Popish, and you have killed it, so far as the rage member of the English Church or nation is concerned.

(3) The Situation To-day.

Is this point of view unjust? Is it untrue that some Anglo- holics are making Rome their aim? No, of course it is not. e rather new phenomenon of our day is that there is a cer- number—some observers think an increasing number—of sts in the Church of England who make Rome their avowed , and are perfectly ready to admit the fact. They are really , but they have lately succeeded in winning some measure of port from men who, though they disagree with a policy which consider unwise, hate what they regard as injustice and one- dness in the administration of discipline. It seems to them air that excesses, if they are to be called such, in one direc- , should be punished by those who are guilty of excesses e as serious in another direction. They do not see that prin- e must be maintained at all costs; nor do they realize the n their action is doing to the cause they love. Thus they in- e themselves in suspicion which alienates from the move- t most of those persons whom we desire to win.

But these are passing considerations. It is necessary to turn he really dominant issues which face the Anglo-Catholic ement, in regard both to the Church of England and the rch of Rome.

(4) The Main Issues.

Let us try to clear things a little. Two final questions really include the answers to many others. The first is, what is the relation of Anglo-Catholics to the authority of the Church of England? And the second is, what is our fundamental quarrel with Rome?

(*a*) It may be said that there are two main schools of thought to-day among Anglo-Catholics in regard to Anglican authority, the one a small minority, often confused with the general body, and the other containing the great majority. The minority group regards the Church in this country as two provinces of the Western Church, with few or no disciplinary rights of her own. 'Rite follows patriarchate' is one of the watchwords of this party, which justifies the use of the entire Roman Mass, and nothing else, in the celebration of the Eucharist. Much else naturally follows from this theory, but the difficulties are immense. It runs contrary to history and to facts; you cannot annihilate four hundred years of actual events, involving many developments and desuetudes, to say nothing of vast changes in popular feeling. The Church of England has since the sixteenth century been a recognized ecclesiastical entity, with many traditions of its own, and has made many departures from the atmosphere and tradition of the Roman Church.

I am not now discussing doctrines; quite apart from them the English Church has beyond dispute come to have her own peculiar and national forms of worship, which she has more than once revised, and which are in almost universal use. In certain matters she claims and exercises her own discipline. The two provinces theory must involve selection in important directions such as, for instance, the duty of submission to or refusal of the authority of the Papacy—no light choice! And if I choose another illustration used in last month's *Modern Churchman* of the insuperable objections to the theory, I shall not, I hope, be thought to indulge merely in a cheap 'score.' For the question of the marriage of the clergy after ordination is in this connection serious and vital. I have never been able to understand how priests who are married, contrary to every principle of the Roman obedience, have the least right to insist on liberties of other kind which are directly forbidden by the bishop of their own diocese

which rest on the authority of the Western Church. The position is really a hopeless one. To some of my readers it may seem absurd even to discuss it, but the fact that it is held by sincere and self-denying men makes it necessary to take it into account. I believe it is doomed to eventual failure, on account of its inherent illogicality; but there is no doubt that in the meantime it is disastrously alienating the clergy and laity, and gravely weakening the Anglo-Catholic cause.

Yet, I must insist again, it is held by very few. The overwhelming number of the Anglo-Catholic clergy and laity are quite sure that in all things lawful and honest they must obey their bishops, difficult as some of the bishops make it for them to do so. We are often forced to feel that the diocesan is less than friendly; we may sometimes even suspect that he is, from our point of view, less than orthodox: in some dioceses the situation is well-nigh desperate. But Anglo-Catholics as a body must make up their minds to obey the Anglican episcopate. Until this is decided they will not be able to pull their weight in the Church of England. I am convinced that most Anglo-Catholics are as unashamedly Anglican as they are stoutly Catholic, and must therefore win the confidence of the rest of the Church and nation.

(*b*) The other problem is if possible more weighty still. Our real quarrel with Rome to-day does not involve the matters which are commonly adduced as dividing us most deeply. I do not think that the average man or woman (and it is the average man and woman whom we have in mind) is much bothered about the consequences of the Papal infallibility, or minutiae of Eucharistic doctrine or questions of jurisdiction. Still less do these double persons of prayer, whose experiences are above and beyond such controversies. When we seek access to the adorable mystery of God all this is left behind.

No: in these modern days our real quarrel with Rome is the intellectual one. Again the *Modern Churchman* is right in maintaining that if we 'had only been satisfied to stand uncompromisingly for liberal and reformed Catholicism, we should have won the gratitude of the English Church as a whole.' Is it now too late? No really Christian person can think of the eventual reunion of the Church without including the Church of Rome;

but it is equally impossible for a thinking modern man or woman to avoid adding that it must (and certainly will) be a reformed Church of Rome. The bounds which Rome at present sets to freedom of thought and candour of theological statement are markedly antiquated, and will in time become fatal, if they are not removed. Consider two outstanding instances of this failure to meet the modern mind. Nearly all educated members of the Church of England, at least among the clergy, have accepted a view of the history and composition of the books of the Bible (both the Old and the New Testaments) which is modern, in the sense that it has been formulated by scholars during the last hundred years. We believe that it is true, and should be taught, though confessedly it means a break with a very ancient tradition.

This view of the Bible is officially rejected by the Roman Church. In this rejection she is followed by a few Anglo-Catholics, as also by Fundamentalists holding very different theological positions. But the overwhelming majority of Anglo-Catholics accept the modern view, and are thankful to be free from the appalling confusion which is involved in the old belief in literal inspiration. Again, the statement of such elementary facts may seem to readers of the *Modern Churchman* unnecessary. It is strange that it should be necessary on account of the too common idea that Anglo-Catholics in general are obscurantists.

My second instance is one which must cause great difficulty to many educated Roman Catholics. The 'worshipping and adoration' of relics is repugnant to the modern religious mind. The questions of genuineness or of beauty (many relics are revoltingly hideous) are comparatively small ones. The real point is that the whole idea belongs to another and a past stage of the Church's history. In innumerable instances historical criticism has riddled through and through the evidence on which the relics have been accepted. I believe there are very few Anglo-Catholics who are not devoutly thankful that at the Reformation the Church of England made a clean sweep of the whole system. There may be a few who would try to restore it, but they are very few, and negligible.

To sum up. The Anglican Communion as a whole, and Anglo-Catholics in particular, stand for a sacramental Christ-

nity which is founded on the ancient tradition, but is capable drawing to itself the best of the modern knowledge, and of rrelating it with the historic faith. Though beset by many aknesses, the English Church has retained a remarkable easure of theological freedom; and in consequence its scholars e placing the whole Christian world under a debt of gratitude. ne Anglo-Catholic movement in regard to these great matters nds with the rest of the Church of England. It is true that we o are Anglo-Catholics must clear our minds in certain direc- ns as quickly as possible. Admittedly we are only doing this adually. Unhappily some of us seem to have fixed our atten- n at the moment on certain relatively small points, and are newhat blind as to the greater issues. But this will pass; and an Anglo-Catholic I see a great opportunity before the move- nt. We need, however, the forbearance, the sympathy, the p, of the authority of the Church of England, and of all those o share our membership in it.

IMPRESSIONS OF MARBURG

by the Rev. J. B. Harford, M.A., B.D., Canon Residentiary of Ripon.

MARBURG on the Lahn is one of the most beautifully situated towns in Germany. It lies about sixty miles th of Frankfort on the Main. Its ancient buildings and eets cluster round the steep sides of a hill whose summit is wned by the old Schloss of the Landgraves of Hesse. This a fine Gothic building, whose Rittersaal dates from 1277. the foot of the hill stands the Elizabethen-Kirche, 'a verit- e gem of the purest Early Gothic style,' erected by the Grand ster of the Teutonic Order in 1235-1283. Its twin western res are a dominating feature in most views of the town. The ep streets, flanked by picturesque ancient buildings, by their y names (Barfusserstrasse,* etc.) recall bygone times. And nd the town rises an amphitheatre of wooded hills, providing endless series of charming walks and lovely views.

* This was either the Pilgrims' Way, trodden bare foot, or the street hich stood the House of the bare-foot Friars. In Ripon we have a Bar- Lane, once used by pilgrims in visiting the shrine of St. Wilfrid.

But the crowning glory of Marburg is its University. So greatly does the University bulk in the life of the town that it has been said with truth: 'Gottingen (and other towns) have a University, Marburg is one.' It was the first University in Germany to be founded under Protestant auspices. Philip the Magnanimous, Landgrave of Hesse, friend of Luther, opened his new University on May 30th, 1527. Two years later the same Prince brought together at Marburg Luther and Zwingli and their respective colleagues with the laudable purpose of securing a united front on the part of the Reformers in the face of the Papal forces. 'The Colloquy of Marburg' failed to secure unanimity on the subject of the Presence in the Holy Communion, but it drew up an agreed statement which paved the way for the Confession of Augsburg in the following year.

From the first the new University attracted to itself scholars from various parts of Europe. Among the first students to be enrolled in 1527 were three remarkable men from our own land.

Patrick Hamilton was a Scotsman of noble birth, grandson on his mother's side of James II of Scotland. He had studied first at the University of Paris and later he went to Louvain, where Erasmus at that time had his headquarters. In 1524 he became a graduate of St. Andrew's, and there he began to preach Reformed doctrines, which speedily drew down upon him the unwelcome attention of Archbishop Seaton. Hamilton fled to Germany, and after a visit to Luther at Wittenberg, came on to Marburg. There he wrote his *Loci Communes*, known in Scotland as *Patrick's Places*. They may be read to-day in Foxe's *Acts and Monuments*. Returning to Scotland late in the same year, he was speedily called to account for his 'heretical' opinions, and on February 29th, 1528, at the age of twenty-four he was burned at the stake. His courageous bearing greatly impressed his fellow-countrymen, and 'the reek of Patrick Hamilton infected all it blew on.'

John Frith was an Englishman, educated at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge, who had been invited by Wolsey to his newly-founded College (now Christ Church) at Oxford. Being in danger by reason of his interest in the Reformation Movement in Germany, he also took refuge at Marburg, where he resided as a graduate student for five years. There he published

several writings, one of them being dated 'at Malborow in the lande of Hesse,' 12th July, 1529. There also he helped Tyndale in his translation of the New Testament. Frith was the first to maintain the view that 'Christ's natural body and blood are in heaven, not here,' which was afterwards incorporated in the 'black rubric' at the end of our Communion Office. He returned to England in 1532, was arrested just as he was about to embark once more for the Continent, and in the following year he followed in Patrick Hamilton's footsteps and died a martyr's death at the stake at Smithfield.

William Tyndale was some ten to twelve years older than his two compatriots. He had already published the first edition of his translation of the New Testament before he took refuge at Marburg with Philip of Hesse. His *Parable of the Wicked Mammon* (1528), *Obedience of a Christian Man* (1528), and *Practyse of Prelates* (1530) were all printed at Marburg. In 1536 he too 'witnessed a good confession' at the stake at Vilforde in the Netherlands. It was dangerous in those days to hold the doctrines taught at Marburg.

These three men were the forerunners of a long line of British scholars who, during the ensuing four centuries, have been attracted to the University of Marburg by the fame of its Professors. To-day its undergraduates number 4,000, and perhaps never in its long history has this ancient University been happier in the men who have occupied its theological chairs than it has been during the first thirty years of the present century.

In this short paper, I propose to refer to three professors of outstanding ability and reputation with whom it was my privilege to enjoy fellowship during a recent stay in Marburg.

The first that I will name is Karl Budde, the Nestor of the Professorial Body. He keeps his eightieth birthday on April 13th of this year. A man of lionlike appearance, he is almost as vigorous to-day, both in mind and body, as at any time in his life. Formidable to his opponents in controversy, he is the most warm-hearted of men to his friends. As early as 1878 his academic thesis on Jeremiah 50-51 won the congratulations of Julius Wellhausen for the skilful way in which he solved a most difficult critical problem. He was the first Old Testament scholar to establish clearly the poetical character of the earlier Hebrew

prophecy. His elucidation of the '*Qinah*' measure, as employed in poems of lamentation, led the way to all subsequent work in this direction. His introductions and commentaries on Old Testament books are well known. His work is broad-based upon a thorough examination of all the available material, and is characterized by the combined boldness and sanity with which the many problems of text and of interpretation are tackled and solved. Karl Budde retired from the active labours of his chair at the age of seventy-one as Professor Emeritus, and for some years another eminent scholar, Gustav Hoelscher, reigned in his stead. But last year the latter moved to Bonn, and, no appointment having been made to the vacant chair by the autumn, Budde was asked to step into the breach for the time being. This he did, and during last winter, in term-time, delivered two lectures a day in consecutive hours on four mornings in the week and conducted a 'seminar' lasting two hours on one afternoon, a remarkable performance in any case at his age, but made more remarkable by the fact that his lectures were delivered extempore with all the vigour and freshness of youth. All being well, Prof. Budde will deliver six lectures on the Hebrew prophets in the latter half of April of this year at Bangor and in the first half of May at King's College, London. These lectures will be in English and will, I am confident, amply repay the time and trouble which may be required in order to attend them.

Rudolf Otto is, I suppose, some fifteen or sixteen years younger than Karl Budde, but he is famous as the author of *Das Heilige*, a treatise which deals with 'the Irrational in the idea of Godhead (or Divinity) and its relation to the Rational.' The first edition came out in 1917 : the seventeenth impression appeared in May of last year. It was translated into English by Prof. J. W. Harvey and published by the Oxford University Press in 1923, under the title *The Idea of the Holy*. Translations have also appeared successively in Swedish, Spanish, Italian, Japanese, Dutch, and French. The originality and depth of thought displayed by the author at once secured the attention of the theological world. Professor Otto has added a new word, 'numinous,' to our vocabulary, and has given a new orientation to our conception of Deity. Unfortunately, of late years, he has not enjoyed good health, and some two years ago

e resigned his chair and became Professor Emeritus. He has strong face and keen eyes, which may appear formidable to strangers, but which sparkle with wit and goodwill for those hom he admits to his fellowship. He takes great interest in far Eastern thought, and has travelled in India and Japan in rder to get into first-hand touch with the mysticism of these ncient lands. His translations from the Sanskrit and his reatises on *West-Ostliche Mystik* and *Die Gnadenreligion ndiens und das Christentum* (just published) show the depth of is understanding of these systems of thought. Last autumn he as the prime mover in the establishment of an Exhibition of Sacred Objects of Foreign Lands' in the University Art-nstitute, and he himself contributed almost the whole of the khibits from the Far East. Although he has not felt able of late lecture in the University, he is still a great force in its intel-ctual life: and his successor, Prof. Frick, carries on the adition.

My third notability is Professor Heiler. He also has a Euro-ean reputation. He began his career by studying Roman Catho-theology. But subsequently his views changed and he joined e Lutheran Church in Sweden. In 1920 he was elected Pro-ssor of Comparative Religion at Marburg. To-day he is one the most appreciated lecturers in theology in that University. is teaching is simply expressed, alive and always to the point. entle in voice and quiet in manner, his mastery of his subject d his lucid exposition of it specially attract students from Eng-nd and, indeed, from other countries as well. One of the most preciative listeners whom I came across was an Icelander, a ry interesting man who, after his stay in Marburg, purposed come to England before returning to his island home. Pro-ssor Heiler is famous as the writer of *Das Gebet*, just going be translated into English. He has also written a valuable lume, *Catholicism and Protestantism*, a second edition of ich is now in preparation. He enjoys the friendship of Bishop ore and other English Churchmen, and has lectured in Oxford d London. He is the elected President of the High Church ssociation, which desires to see their Public Worship enriched the restoration of Catholic elements. Both he and Prof. Otto, ile approaching the subject from somewhat different angles,

are deeply interested in this question of the enrichment and renewal of Public Worship, and one of the most interesting and helpful sides of life in Marburg, as I saw it, was the provision by both men of a Saturday service at 8.30 p.m., with special regard to the devotional needs of University students, although attendance is not confined to them. Two small ancient churches have been brought into use for this purpose, and they are well filled during term-time. At both, full provision is made for congregational participation, in the one case by the supply of litanies and other services with responses: in the other by a Book of Canticles and Psalms, arranged for chanting. Prof. Heiler has a beautiful voice, and his singing of the first half of each verse to a Gregorian chant, with the response of the congregation, completing the verse, was most pleasing. Prof. Otto's *Zur Erneuerung und Ausgestaltung des Gottesdienstes* contains many valuable suggestions, of which perhaps the most striking is his proposal for Sacramental Worship. The present method is to hold at 9.30 a.m. a service of Preparation, at 10 a.m. Morning Service with a sermon of at least half an hour, and then at 11.15 the actual Communion Service. This does not seem to work well. On one Sunday, last November, the church was filled with a large congregation at 10 a.m., but only seven remained for the Communion. Otto's suggestion to meet this very unsatisfactory state of things is that on Communion Sundays the 10 a.m. Morning Service should correspond in character to our Ante-Communion Service, and that at 5 p.m. the actual Communion should take place, to which those should come who for special reasons—recent bereavement, commemorations of the departed, corporate reunions, first Communion after Confirmation, etc., etc.—wish to partake.[1]

These are but a few jottings of persons and things which interested me at Marburg during a stay of nearly three months (October—December 1929). But I hope that I have said enough to suggest, to my younger readers at any rate, the idea that no more helpful and repaying method of employing a possible interval between College and Ordination could be found than that of spending it at the University of Marburg.

[1] See also the April number of Sir Henry Lunn's *Review of the Churches* for a valuable paper by Professor Otto, which he read to the Conference held at Marburg last year, in commemoration of 'The Colloquy of Marburg' (1529).

THE FATHER OF 'GOOD' CHURCHMEN

By the Rev. J. C. Hardwick, M.A., B.Sc., Vicar of Partington.

SAMUEL Wilberforce was ordained in 1828, and the Church at this period was not too popular. In most cathedral cities the bishop, as he sipped his port on November 5th, could scent the smoke of the bonfire which was consuming his own effigy at the palace gates. The Bishop of Bristol's palace was actually burnt down in one of these affectionate demonstrations. The Bishop of Lichfield narrowly escaped lynching; and in Canterbury the Primate himself was insulted, spat upon, and only brought by a circuitous route to safety, amidst the execrations of an infuriated crowd.

Such displays of enmity were natural enough. The Church, it is true, was doing little or no visible harm to the country at large, which was suffering under a post-war economic depression. But their opposition to the demand for the reform of the franchise, combined with their wealth, made the bishops the objects of popular resentment.

Young Wilberforce, looking out on a disturbed world from the remote fastness of a country curacy, was not too optimistic:

> 'My own belief is that things will grow worse and worse. I think that the Church will fall within fifty years entirely, and the State will not survive it much longer.'

This was in 1829. A year or two later, when he was Rector of the pleasant parish of Brighstone, in the Isle of Wight, where rick-burnings were the order of the day, he expresses himself in a style which shows promise of his future pulpit reputation:

> 'When I look around I see on every side the visible threatenings of Providence; a discontented people, one class pressing upon another, and all at war between themselves; an assaulted Church ill-defended, and the whole of Europe shaken to its base by the volcanic throes of revolution.'

The immediate result was, of course, the Reform Parliament and (for the Church of England) the rigours of the Ecclesiastical Commission. Wilberforce was still too young to influence the course of events, but he took the line of very few reformers—he cultivated his garden. The parish of Brighstone, through the efforts of its indefatigable young rector, became everything that

a parish should be. The number of services and of sermons was increased; meetings in distant hamlets were arranged, Sunday Schools and communicants' classes provided, and so on—things unheard of in those days. Even a hymn-book was compiled (Wilberforce himself sometimes lapsed into verse, and Lyte, the author of 'Abide with me,' was a friend).

These activities were of more than local importance, for Wilberforce was laying down the lines on which parochial life was to run in England for the rest of the century. He started the cult of parochial efficiency which the redistribution of revenues imposed on the Church by the sacrilegious hand of Parliament had rendered possible. While some of Wilberforce's friends were shrilly denouncing the national apostasy, Samuel took off his coat and proceeded to reorganize the whole parochial life of England. Though he disliked Radicals as much as any man, he knew how to reap where they had sown.

The future Bishop of Oxford had, of course, been reared in the straightest sect of Evangelicalism. William Wilberforce, the great emancipator of the slaves, had been a 'converted' man of fashion, and his singular letters to his schoolboy son remain models of paternal piety and curiosities of literature:

> 'I think my dear Saml is greatly improved in bearing little crosses of his inclinations properly, and I recollected this would reach you on a Sunday.'
>
> 'I shall pray for you to-morrow between 2 and 3 o'clock, and again between 8 and 9.'

In the case of Samuel, not only had Oxford made a difference (who can escape her lures?), but this young clergyman with his boyish appearance was definitely post-war. He had learned the Napoleonic lesson of the supreme value of *discipline* both in Church and State. As in politics (after a brief fever of undergraduate liberalism) he had become a Tory, so in religion he became an *institutionalist*. He had his doubts about the transports of Evangelical fervour which had meant so much to his father. In the case of such a man as William Wilberforce, of secure position and sound principles, enthusiasm might do little or no harm. But among the 'lower orders,' the results were often dangerous. Amongst them, undisciplined religion generated the poison of Dissent or Antinomianism, combined with hostility to the Church and her bishops. Moreover, the perceptive eye of Samuel Wilberforce saw too well the real weakness of all

religious enthusiasms—they do not endure. The fever abates, and the patient is left exhausted but restless—a ready prey to temptation.

Samuel Wilberforce, as was fitting in a coming bishop, was given to hospitality, and upon one occasion the great Mr. Simeon visited Brighstone, and the subject of Evangelical religion kept them talking late into the night. Before retiring, the conscientious rector jotted down notes of his visitor's conversation, with his own comments thereon.

> 'Simeon, contrasting this time with Whitfield's and Wesley's, spoke of the coldness now : " Such men as Daniel Wilson, Marsh, etc., labouring with but little or no fruit. There's a *do* [*dew*] everywhere but a shower nowhere.' *Quaere* (1) The truth of this statement? (2) If true, *does it not arise from a mistaken expectation of some effusion of the Holy Spirit different from* that vouchsafed by God in His Ordinances to all who seek for it?'

Here we have the authentic institutionalist note. If religion was to be saved, it would not be by emotionalism, but by *organization*. If the Spirit was to be kept from evaporating, it must be incorporated in a disciplined institution.

'I am less and less of a politician,' we find Wilberforce writing in 1834, while conducting a campaign against Dissent at Newport, 'I am a strong Churchman, and if a man is only a Churchman I can forgive him anything else in the world.'

John Henry Newman, of course, had recognized quite as clearly as Samuel Wilberforce the cultural poverty, and the sporadic nature, of Low Church or Dissenting piety. But the more logical mind of the future Cardinal perceived what was really involved if one returned to the Religion of Authority—or, if he did not see it at first, saw it later. But Wilberforce had the happy gift of disregarding logic in favour of the practical *via media*, a path which finer minds than his either could not see, or, if they saw, rejected. Mediocrity of vision is the first qualification for success in ecclesiastical statesmanship.

Though far from being a Tractarian (when he became bishop, he kept Dr. Pusey under what was practically an inhibition), Wilberforce had the acumen to perceive how valuable were certain elements in the new Oxford gospel for the ends he had in view. As early as October 1833, we find him preaching the sermon at the Bishop's Visitation at Newport—a discourse which met with the most flattering reception from his Lordship, where-

in the clergy are called upon to 'prize at a higher rate that unbroken succession whereby those who ordained us are joined unto Christ's own Apostles.' It added a strong warning against 'the danger of quitting the high vantage ground of Apostolical authority,' and spoke of King Charles I as he 'whom we fear not to call a martyr.' This language has since become familiar, but at the time it had all the charm of novelty—even of dangerous novelty—and we can excuse one of the preacher's friends for warning him against the 'serious calamity of entertaining extreme opinions.' But Samuel knew quite well what he was doing.

He was, in fact, not only a Churchman, but a High Churchman. He was coloured by the Catholic revival just sufficiently for parts of its propaganda to be an exploitable commodity in his hands. He used it adoitly to create 'good Churchmanship' amongst the clergy, and as a fulcrum for the lever of increased ecclesiastical activity. He made the clergy self-conscious, gave them solidarity, and infused into them confidence and pride in their office. It may sound ridiculous to compare 'Soapy Sam' with Ignatius Loyola, but the parallel is not completely fantastic. As the founder of the Society of Jesus put Papalism on its legs again after the shock of the Reformation, so did Samuel Wilberforce rescue the Church of England from the doubts and discouragements suggested by the interrogations and defection of Newman. He restored the Church's faith in itself, by administering a tonic to the clergy, and by invigorating parochial life throughout the country.

But Wilberforce's was not merely a *clerical* movement; his influence with the laity was immense. The memory of his father's achievements stood him in good stead, he had hosts of influential friends, and early in his career he became a *persona grata* at Court. He had a remarkable gift for *canalizing* enthusiasm: having made people into good Churchmen, he kept them busy with institutional activities, and to him belongs the special credit of having used Foreign Missions both as a means to generate 'keenness' (to use the modern phrase) and also as a sphere wherein that 'keenness' might find a practical outlet.

Wilberforce was the first to conduct missionary propaganda upon modern lines, and it was this that made his reputation both as a speaker and as an active, bustling, indefatigable clergyman.

His diary of his S.P.G. tour in Devon and Cornwall in 1839 makes one as breathless as Wesley's journal. He rushes from one place to another, preaches three times on a Sunday, each time for three-quarters of an hour; speaks for an hour and a half at Plymouth ('and D.G. very successfully; Bishop *too civil*'), attends social functions ('Dinner of 80. Pleasant evening'), and so on. Success and adulation kept him going.[1]

By 1840, at the age of thirty-five, Wilberforce had become Archdeacon of Surrey, and had accepted the important living of Alverstoke. During his five years' tenure of the office, he personally visited almost every parish in his jurisdiction; he brought the clergy of each rural deanery together in at least quarterly meetings; and in his Charges he continually voiced his ideals of activity, efficiency, and discipline, painting a spirited picture of 'the compact phalanx of the Church, which in her union would be terrible as an army with banners.'

Although forced to be absent from his parish by his Archidiaconal functions, by his statutory residence as Canon of Winchester, and by his visits to Court, he nevertheless during his incumbency managed to build national schools at Alverstoke, a church at Elson, and both a church and large national schools at Gosport. He laid securely the foundations of that vigorous parochial life of which the famous parish of Portsea became a centre. Indeed the labours of Wilberforce at Alverstoke, like those of his contemporary Hook at Leeds, revolutionized the parochial life of England. Heartiness, energy, and business efficiency became the recognized qualifications for success in the Anglican ministry.

In October 1845 the inevitable happened. On the afternoon of Tuesday, the 14th, while Wilberforce was sitting with his mother-in-law, a messenger arrived from Sir Robert Peel with the offer of the bishopric of Oxford. 'I had wished for this, and now that it comes it seems *awful*,' wrote the delighted Archdeacon in his diary; and to his *confidante*, his 'dearest sister,' Miss Noel, he wrote: 'You will understand how, without real

[1] It is curious to note how Evangelicalism and anti-slavery zeal in the father become in the son zeal for the Church and Foreign Missions. In their days influential and financial circles were interested in Missions. The Lord Mayor of London would take the chair at an S.P.G. meeting, three or four hundred leading bankers and merchants would be present, besides the two Archbishops, and with Wilberforce billed to speak success was certain. This was in the 'hungry forties.'

inconsistency, I yet feel I could not decline the offer so made.' Sir Robert's letter had been remarkably cordial, and an affirmative reply was dispatched without delay.

Dr. Pusey, in his lodgings at Christ Church, heard the news with mixed feelings. The times were out of joint; only a fortnight had passed since Mr. Newman, with Mr. Oakley and two others, had 'sought admission to the one fold of Christ' at the hands of Dr. Wiseman. The attitude of the new bishop would be unsympathetic, and the anxious professor poured out his misgivings in a letter of congratulation:

> 'It does seem strange, and is, I trust, a token of God's mercy that, whereas some of the offices of a Bishop wd seem fitted to your natural gifts, you shd, by God's appointment, have been called to a see wh most of all requires supernatural. . .
>
> 'It is indeed a time of intense anxiety; we have scarcely seen the beginning of the troubles with which we are threatened. I fear the unsettlement is exceeding great.'

The new bishop was determined to reduce the prevailing unsettlement to within manageable limits; and, so far as possible, to remove its causes—one of the chief of which he held to be Dr. Pusey himself. An interesting correspondence followed in which the theologian and the administrator displayed their mutual incompatibility, both of temperament and of ideas. Dr. Pusey's policy had been one of keeping in touch with Rome, by

> 'not holding himself obliged to renounce any doctrine *formally* decreed by the Roman Church,' but clinging fast to anything which 'might ultimately become the basis of union between us.'

But to Wilberforce, who had a lively hatred (the word is not too strong) of Rome, any contentions of this sort seemed either frivolous or insincere. He had no use for the professor's anxious prevarications, and did not hesitate to lecture him as suffering from 'a subtle and therefore most dangerous form of self-will, and a tendency to view yourself as one in, if not now the leader of, a party.' Into the sympathetic ear of Miss Noel, the Bishop poured his real feelings:

> 'I see that he has greatly helped, and is helping, to make a party of semi-Romanisers in the Church, to lead some to Rome, to drive back from sound Church views those amongst us who love Christ, for another half century.'

'*Sound Church views*'! That was what so distressed the new bishop. Dr. Pusey was not only leading people to Rome, he was driving 'good Churchmen,' who believed in the Apostolical Succession, back into Evangelicalism and the Low

Church quagmire. All Wilberforce's plans for a renewed Church life were being undermined by Dr. Pusey's incurable stupidity. Samuel's vision (so much more practicable than most visions) of an efficient and active Church, 'like an army with banners,' with Convocation restored, and every parish equipped with schools, mission-churches, and a loyal and energetic incumbent—this must be stultified by the well-meant treachery of a pedant who did not know his own mind! Wilberforce, as he paced his garden at Cuddesdon, his head bursting with plans, was full of excusable vexation with Dr. Pusey.

There was a tragic side to Wilberforce's professional success. He spent all his life injecting into the body of the Church an anti-toxin against the poison of Romanism—*i.e.* 'Good Churchmanship,' or moderate Catholicism (though he never used that hated word). And yet it was his fate to suffer personal losses to the Roman Church which were almost, if not quite, without parallel.

The first of his relations to enter the Roman Church was George Ryder, his brother-in-law, who took his wife with him. His three brothers, Robert, the Archdeacon of the East Riding (whose secession was a stunning blow to Samuel), William, his eldest, and Henry, his youngest, brother (for whom he had secured the living of East Farleigh), all followed; and there was the even more notorious case of Archdeacon Manning, his wife's brother-in-law. And beside this, his only daughter, with her husband, completed the tale. It was calamitous, especially as his critics (quite unjustly) said that Samuel would have gone over too, but for his preferments.

There is much to be said for 'good Churchmanship' and an implicit belief in the Apostolical Succession, but as a prophylactic to Romanism it is perilously ineffective. Wilberforce learned something of this through his experiences with his new theological college at Cuddesdon, which gave its founder many sleepless nights. He rightly saw that the training of the clergy is the strategic point in Church policy, and he founded his college to be under his immediate eye, so that a new generation of clergymen should grow up inspired by his own ideals of good Churchmanship and parochial efficiency. But he had endless trouble with the place. The college was High Church—there was no harm in that; but the drift towards Puseyism seemed

incurable. The young men began by believing in the Apostolical Succession, but they ended by believing very much more than was good for them. Most young men are fools; but to be of any use to Wilberforce, they had to be fools of the right kind, and this it was not easy to guarantee.

> 'Our men are too *peculiar*—some, at least, of our best men . . . I consider it a heavy affliction that they should wear neckcloths of peculiar construction, coats of peculiar cut, whiskers of peculiar dimensions—that they should walk with a peculiar step, carry their heads at a peculiar angle, and read in a peculiar tone.'

These idiosyncrasies were perhaps harmless, but the Bishop, in casual visits to the young men's rooms, saw much that displeased him.

> 'The tendency to crowd the walls with pictures of the *Mater Dolorosa*, etc., their chimney-pieces with crosses, their studies with saints, all offend me and do incalculable injury to the College in the eye of chance visitors. The habit of some of our men of kneeling in a sort of rapt prayer on the steps of the communion-table, when they cannot be *alone* there, when visitors are coming in and going out . . .'

This continental and seminarist tone was far from being compatible with the founder's wishes. Nor was he quite confident about the views of his vice-principal.

> 'On the Eucharistic question I feel that, although I and Liddon have never had a word like dispute since we have been together, we are mutually conscious of a difference on this point and so are the men.'

Consequently when the Principal offered his resignation to the Bishop, 'on the ground of ill-health,' the post was given not to Liddon but to the Rev. H. H. Swinny, a man who satisfied the theological requirements of Wilberforce, by whom he was described as 'a thoroughly earnest, devoted Church of England Christian, sound on the Sacraments, and very likely to influence young men.'

It is not surprising in a month or two's time to find Mr. Liddon complaining to the Bishop that he is placed 'in a most difficult position,' and his Lordship replying that 'it is, of course, impossible to work the college for God's glory on a system of really discordant teaching between us.' So that the following month the inevitable happened, and Mr. Liddon resigned. All this was very painful to the Bishop.

Wilberforce had described his own position as belonging 'to the Spiritual and not to the Ecclesiastical division of the School [of High Churchmen].' But the distinction is too fine

for the Oxford pass-man to discern, and in any case the line (if there be one) is very easily overstepped. Cuddesdon was a troublesome nursery.

Yet the lesson was quite lost on Wilberforce. He failed to see that even Spiritual High Churchism is insecurely poised upon an inclined plane upon which a logical sense acts like grease. He could not perceive that there is only one effective antidote to Rome—not Evangelicalism, nor yet even Spiritual and Non-Ecclesiastical High Churchism, but *Liberalism*.

Of Liberalism Wilberforce was scarcely less terrified than had been Newman himself. He would have regarded this cure as worse than the disease. On more than one occasion in his career, notably in the Hampden case, and in the case of *Essays and Reviews*, Wilberforce came up against Liberalism, and he reacted to it as a cat reacts to a strange terrier.

In 1847, along with twelve other bishops, he signed the Remonstrance addressed to Lord John Russell, voicing the 'apprehension and alarm which have been excited in the minds of the clergy by the rumoured nomination to the See of Hereford of Dr. Hampden.' The matter was conducted, as befitted an ecclesiastical assassination, with all due delicacy. 'It was not intended,' wrote one of the protesting prelates to the Press, 'as a hostile protest or as part of a system of agitation; it was expressly designed to be a private and friendly representation to the Prime Minister of dangers which we saw reason to apprehend, and of which we were disposed to think he was not equally aware.'

Lord John, however, took it otherwise.

> 'I cannot sacrifice the reputation of Dr. Hampden, the rights of the Crown, and what I believe to be the true interests of the Church, to a feeling which I believe to be founded on misapprehension and fomented by prejudice.'

The University of Oxford then came to the rescue of its maligned professor, and fifteen out of the twenty-two Heads of Houses signed an expression of confidence in him. It was at this point that the Bishop of Oxford tried his hand by writing a personal letter to Lord John, asking that Dr. Hampden might be called on 'to disprove before a competent tribunal the truth of these charges.'

> 'Reasonable men do not wish to see Dr. Hampden put down by clamour. But they believe that the highest of all interests requires

that a Divine, openly charged by sufficient authority with unsoundness in the Truth, should not be consecrated a Bishop until he has cleared himself of the charge.'

To the sympathetic ear of Miss Noel, the Bishop confided his troubles.

'This whole Hampden business is *very* painful to me. It is so like hunting a man down that I am at times sick at heart, and feel I could do anything to show him how I hate persecuting him.'

It was, indeed, a distressing affair, but in the cause of Truth the Bishop displayed a righteous pertinacity which does him the utmost credit. As a Professor in the University, Dr. Hampden was exempt from episcopal control. But, by a happy dispensation of Providence he was also beneficed in the diocese, and held the Vicarage of Ewelme which was then annexed to the Regius Professorship of Divinity. Thus a suit might be instituted under the Church Discipline Act of 1840 against Dr. Hampden as a beneficed clergyman in the diocese of Oxford, before his diocesan, for heretical teaching.

The Bishop did not feel able himself to *promote* any such suit against his victim, 'but if such a suit were begun in the Consistory Court of this diocese I should at once transmit it by Letters of Request to the Court of Arches.'

Meanwhile the Government saw no necessity for the testing of their nominee's orthodoxy, and Dr. Hampden, in an open letter to Lord John Russell, preferred no request for a judicial investigation, but limited himself to bitter complaints of persecution, and renewed affirmations of his own personal faith in the fundamentals of Christianity. It did not even contain a reference to the righteous Remonstrance of the thirteen bishops!

In view of this contumacy, both on the part of Lord John and the Professor, the Bishop had no choice but to sign the Letters of Request, whereby he gave his sanction to the commencement of a suit in the Arches Court, in which definite charges would be alleged against Dr. Hampden, and full opportunity afforded him to purge himself from the suspicion of false doctrine.

Having thus loaded his pistol, the Bishop now wrote to Dr. Hampden and tried to induce him to issue some statement such as would make the trial unnecessary; and by the same post to the Prime Minister informing him of the steps he had taken, and enclosing a copy of his letter to the Professor.

Lord John was not disposed to be disturbed.

'Is the attempt about to be made to end in the suppression of all learned inquiry,' he asked, 'all dispassionate discussion, all freedom of thought and opinion? You must excuse me if I refuse to enter such a labyrinth, or to interfere any further with Dr. Hampden's judgment on his own position.'

As for Dr. Hampden, conscious that Lord John would stick to his guns, he disregarded the pistol, and wrote a letter which was a grave disappointment to the now agitated Bishop. He not only declined to see any distinction between transmitting a process officially and originating it oneself (a distinction upon which the more sensitive episcopal conscience had laid great stress), but refused to answer any of the doctrinal queries contained in the letter. 'If the queries which this letter contains had come from any other source, or been addressed to me under other circumstances, I think I should have been justified in considering that an insult was not only conveyed but intended to be conveyed to me, by having such elementary tests applied to one who holds the position I do.'

In spite of this disappointing result, the pistol failed to go off, the Archbishop wrote to urge the dropping of the suit, and in due course the Letters of Request were withdrawn, and the defeated Bishop consoled himself by writing to Archdeacon Wilberforce.

'It seems to me that this stir has shown *great* life in the Church and power of resistance . . . *Private.—The Government tottered as it was.*'

There are always consolations.

The *Essays and Reviews* case, some thirteen years later, also found Samuel Wilberforce a resolute watch-dog of orthodoxy. The *Quarterly Review* of January 1861 contained a trenchant criticism of the peccant volume from the Bishop's anonymous pen, which caused that issue to pass through five editions. It was Wilberforce who drew up the letter, signed by the Primate, the Archbishop of York, and twenty-four bishops (including Hampden of Hereford!), which conveyed a reply to the agitated Address sent by the alarmed clergy to their 'fathers-in-God.' The language of the encyclical was calculated to allay the panic naturally aroused.

'Our main hope is in our reliance on the blessing of God, in the continued and increasing earnestness with which we trust that we and the clergy of our several dioceses may be enabled to teach and preach that good deposit of sound doctrine which our Church teaches in its fulness.'

Indeed Oxford clearly took the lead with his brother bishops in this grave crisis, and he was urgent for some 'synodical act' whereby the *book*, rather than the individual essayists (several of whom had intimate friends upon the Bench) might be condemned.

> 'We are, I believe, already agreed, especially on the duty of the Church' (wrote Wilberforce to his colleague of Llandaff) by some *public* and *official* act (if permitted), clearing herself from complicity with those who, teaching in her name, teach men to give up God's Word, Creation, Redemption and the Work of God the Holy Ghost.'

In the end Convocation accepted an adverse report on the book drawn up by the Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Canterbury, as containing 'false and dangerous statements, and reasonings at variance with the Church of England.' This was a triumph for Wilberforce, not only as having been the most active of the bishops in this important affair, but because he had been largely responsible for the revival of Convocation, which was an essential part of his Church policy. Thus 'for the first time since 1711 the Church of England had pronounced synodically upon a question of Doctrine. The silence of 150 years had been broken, and she had again asserted her position as having authority in controversies of faith.' It was natural that, when the strings of her tongue were loosed, she should talk nonsense, but the prestige of Wilberforce soared. He seemed safe for the Primacy, for as yet he was only fifty-five, and no man was better able to pull strings. Even to-day his ability here has not been surpassed.

This affair took place about six months after the Bishop of Oxford's famous encounter with T. H. Huxley. The clergy cheered their champion, but educated men everywhere blushed for him. This attempt to smash Darwinism by an appeal to the gallery was indeed all too characteristic of Wilberforce's mentality, and serves as good evidence that he was quite unable to understand, and still less to face, the intellectual problems with which the Church was now confronted. The curious may find the details of his encounter in the *Life of Huxley*, Volume I, pp. 179—189.

It may indeed be said that Samuel Wilberforce's brilliant career was one long and largely successful attempt to evade intellectual problems by the now familiar method of concen-

trating upon so-called practical affairs. He never faced the problems raised by Newman on the one hand, nor those raised by the Essayists (the *Septem contra Christum*) and by Darwin on the other. The Bishop's life was devoted to an attempt to show that it was unnecessary to face any such problems—they might safely be shelved and ignored. The one thing necessary in his eyes was institutional efficiency: he believed in machinery and in results. He was the fore-runner of what is now known as Americanism in religious life—*i.e.* 'the gospel of boost.' He was the first great ecclesiastical pragmatist. He was all for ready-made and specious solutions; 'good Churchmanship' was one of his shoddy improvisations.

Yet one would not wish to belittle Wilberforce: he certainly left his mark upon the Church of England. More than any other single man he was responsible for the Church which those of us who are old enough can remember at the close of the nineteenth century—the Church of Gilbert Scott screens, coloured stoles, hearty services, breezy clergy, and crowded congregations. Yet by the turn of the century cracks were already appearing in this imposing fabric, and when political Liberalism came into power with its democratic and humanitarian programme, much of the work of the parochial clergy was short-circuited. Also, arrears of neglected theological problems were piling up. The cracks widened. Then came the War, and it would hardly be too much to say that the roof fell in.

Then when the War ended (or even before) the jerry-builders got to work on the job of repairing a dilapidated fabric. 'Life and Liberty' and the Enabling Act were to rebuild Jerusalem.

But, alas, the influence of Wilberforce still persisted, his ghost still presided over the Church of England. The renovators were still preoccupied with organization—with statistics, with machinery, with 'stunts.' Intellectual problems were again relegated to the background or their existence denied. The only pressing problems were problems of finance, of organization, of centralization. Is not our new ecclesiastical oligarchy, with its inability to face doctrinal issues; with its disciplinary shifts and subterfuges; its pathetic belief in machinery, in money, in numbers, inspired by the spirit of Samuel Wilberforce? Is not the typical Anglican Bishop to-day 'Soapy Sam' *redivivus*?

PRAYER AND THE NATURE OF GOD

By the Rev. E. J. MARTIN, D.D., author of *The Emperor Julian,* etc.

I.

IT would be futile to discuss prayer without first giving some indication of the nature of our belief in God as the basis of our prayers. There are three general modes of thinking of God. (*a*) As existent, external to the universe, but bound to it by living connection of mind or of spirit. This is the traditional Christian mode. (*b*) As coming into existence, becoming rather than being. This is the view of popular quasi-scientific theology. Mr. H. G. Wells has probably done most to popularize it. There is a measure of support given to it by at least one of our greatest philosophers, Professor Alexander. It is implied too in much of the later nineteenth century English theology, especially through the influence of the *Lux Mundi* school, though one of that group, J. R. Illingworth, realized the danger and resisted it. (*c*) God as non-existent in actuality. This is a theology found compatible with a religious mentality, *e.g.* in Buddhism, in some of the later Nominalists like Ockham, in Spinoza, and in Mr. Middleton Murry.

It is the second position that is to be criticized, for it is a slope that inevitably leads to the third. It is commonly suggested (*e.g.* by W. Lippmann, *A Preface to Morals*) that even the orthodox have completely abandoned the old conception of God as a being who rules the universe from outside it, the great king over all the earth; that now God is conceived as the spirit or energy within the universe, kinetic and not static. If the belief in a static God were replaced by belief in a kinetic God, a great deal of the scheme of prayer would need to be readjusted.[1]

If we analyse the great religions of man, we find that they ultimately fall into two groups. (1) Pantheistic, which confound the actual and the ideal, which admit of no otherness, and eventually must be non-ethical. Most Oriental religion and some

[1] Ability to meet this criticism is the strength of the Barth School. *Cf.* H. E. Brunner, *Theology of Crisis,* passim.

Christian mysticism verge to that philosophy, while Judaism and Islam are the great practical protests against it. (2) Theistic, the essential thought of which is that God is other than the worshipper and no ultimate fusion of the two is possible. One of the effects of the advance of physical science has been a growing fear in England and America of plain theism. Afraid of being thought anthropomorphic, people will not call God Person, Will, or Mind. An escape has been devised in Immanence, often in the quite crude sense that God is a finer matter present in the material world, in the way the steam is present in the engine. But if God is Spirit, He cannot be in space at all. He is in the world not as immanent, but in the same sense in which a man is in his own thought and even in the expression of his own thought, word, writing or picture. We may continue that simile and say that the universe is the thought of God. But we shall also have to say that God is not the sum of all the wills and thoughts and feelings of the universe. God is always outside His thought as the painter is outside the picture. No person's thought is identical with another person's thought, however like it it may be. God's thoughts are not our thoughts. But no more are our thoughts God's thoughts. That is to say, there is something which the Divine is not. Men may be like God, but they are not part of God. There is in man a likeness to God, but nothing we can think or see points us to a stage when there has been or will be an identity of God and man. And for that reason, not being Monophysites, we should not admit that Jesus, though God, was or is identical with God.[2]

That God is revealed through men is self-evident; but this is not because the men are God. It is because they are not God that there can be shown through them something other than themselves. The process of depersonalizing God always tends to move downwards. Phrases like 'the ultimate reality which we call God' are very common and are indications of subconscious acceptance of religion without God, cosmic emotion. The influence of Otto working on this attitude is pushing many into what Mr. F. R. Barry calls 'numinous obscurantism.'

[2] The debt of this argument is to Rashdall's 'The alleged Immanence of God' in *Ideas and Ideals*.

II.

God then is not a metaphor for the cosmic purpose or the cosmic consciousness. God is separate from the world. That object in the world which is most akin to God is man. Relationship between God and man is for that reason possible. Interposed between God and man, however, is Nature, animate and inanimate. What has God to do with that? We may say that it is an effect whose ultimate cause is God. Much of Nature's working is so uniform that we can almost say it works under definite laws or rules. Why this is so we do not know, nor indeed do we know how far this is so. But we can say that though in Nature, as Mr. J. S. Bezzant remarks, we know nothing of laws that never shall be broken, we know a good deal of laws that never are broken. It is that element of merciless uniformity in Nature that has led to the formulation of the theory of God coming into being and struggling with the blind forces of the universe. Here we reach the great crux in our thoughts of God and man.

The real difficulty is God's relation to Nature. That the weather, the tides, the planets, the earthquakes, the storms have anything to do with God seems to civilized man the point at which traditional religion breaks down. It is far easier for us to see God as one who healeth the broken in heart than it is to believe that He is one who telleth the number of the stars. Our position is the direct antithesis to that of primitive man, to whom God is naturally *Yahweh*, he who *falls* in the thunder and the rain. The thirty-eighth chapter of Job, which appears to have been intended to be a support to faith, is to us something of a shaker of faith. We shall have to say quite honestly that the problem of God in Nature is like the problem of Evil insoluble. The denial of God in no way helps to solve either. In fact if we remove God, we soon find we have to replace Him under another name. We cannot simply say that nothing means anything, because we can easily find facts of life that have purpose and meaning, *e.g.* the growth of food, the reliability of much in Nature, many indications that, as Canon Streeter says, the universe is friendly. It is as difficult to eliminate God from Nature as to find a place for Him.

But it is man rather than Nature that is the associate of God. That is to say, we meet God on the spiritual and moral level

rather than the physical. That will be important when we come to consider the content of prayer. Prayer will move on spiritual and moral rather than on physical levels. Prayer is contact with God by virtue of our affinity with Him on those same spiritual and moral levels. Contact on the physical level seems improbable.

The argument then is that God is other than man or men, that there is likeness and therefore association between God and man, but this has not been, is not, and will not be identity. God is Spirit, but that does not mean that He is an indiscernible something somewhere. It does not mean that He is an energy or an élan vital; He is being, self-moved, self-conscious, and impermeable by other beings. The relationship between God and the external world (apart from man) cannot be described. We may say that the universe is God's creation, but we shall have to admit a qualification, namely, that Nature is a limitation of God. Much too that happens in the field of Nature does not happen on the moral and spiritual plane, and therefore for religion is wide of the point at which God and man are in contact. We cannot refuse anyone his belief that the voice of the Lord breaketh the cedar trees, if he wants to hold such a belief; but it will be wiser to look for the hand of God where a moral and spiritual value is apparent. It would not be in keeping with a spiritual outlook to pray for such issues as that the shadow should go back ten degrees on the dial of Ahaz.

Standing above that mysterious field of Nature there is something unequivocally in touch with God, and that is man. It is through man that God's sovereignty in Nature is visibly expressed. For, so far as we know, the only vehicle of the Divine, the Divine as moral and spiritual, is man or men. God does not work through things, but through men.[3] In some degree man is a sovereign being. He is like God, in Leibniz's word, a Monad. The ultimately real Being then is God and the spirits of men. Men are subordinate to God, but are not without self-existence of their own. They are God's creation, but are not

[3] Men can, of course, use things as *media* for expressing God's purpose, *e.g.* in sacraments. But sacraments are really symbols to which man has given a God-related significance. They have meaning not *per se* but contingently, *i.e.* because men have agreed to give them a meaning.

more part of God than the child is part of the parent. But the association of origin can be perpetuated by an association of voluntary choice.

III.

That leads us to enquire what is the nature of Prayer. Prayer is a quest for association with God by voluntary choice. It is not the association of part of God's being confined in us with the rest of God's being at large—deep calling to deep. It is the intercourse of individual sovereign powers with their sovereign Lord, co-operation of wills founded on individual responsibility. Prayer is then not an earnest attempt to clarify the best within, to deepen resolution, and to discipline impulse. Impersonal mental effort of that kind requires no God, and such is not prayer in any Christian sense. To will the good is not what the Christian means by prayer. He means throwing himself upon a Power and Will other than himself, in the belief that final Good is not his own aspirations nor the collective good wills of men, but is embodied in One Personal Will outside them all and outside the universe itself.

The effect of such intercourse will be double. (1) It will make the will of God operative *among those who pray*, for it will promote readiness to receive what God has to give. Without receiving there can be no giving. In consequence our prayers will make a difference to us, and through us upon the world on the moral and spiritual plane. (2) It will inform the wills of those praying and often transform them by revealing to them something of God's will, and will thus produce an effect on the characters of those who pray. So far as man is able to bring all his life and concerns on to that moral plane, his prayer will affect the whole of his life.

But what of prayer outside those who actually offer it? What effect has intercession? The primary value is to those who pray rather than to those prayed for. It opens their wills and aspirations to entirely selfish ends. But again it is hardly accurate to give the name of prayer to an exercise so conceived. We may organize intercession for the Diocesan Fund or for the Christians in Russia, and the result may only be a mode of preaching or of propaganda and actually may be indistinguishable from a resolution of sympathy moved by the congregation.

In common practice there seems to be only the vaguest notion of what is implied in praying publicly for persons or objects by name. Wyclif held that it was wrong in principle to do so, as giving the impression that such a person had a special pull with God that is denied to those whose names are not mentioned. Manning's belief that he was made Cardinal by the interposition of the Holy Spirit on account of the number of Masses said for that intention involves a view that preferential treatment can be bespoken for those who are able to set the necessary process in operation.[4]

IV.

One or two more pedestrian problems suggest themselves. How should prayer be formulated and how should the words be spoken? The principles laid down by our Lord are (*a*) Brevity, (*b*) Simplicity, (*c*) Generality rather than particularity. All are implied in the Lord's Prayer. These principles seem to have been observed steadily in the Church for many centuries. They are maintained in the Book of Common Prayer in the prayers taken over from the Latin books, *e.g.* such Collects as that for the Seventh Sunday after Trinity, 'Lord of all power and might,' and for the Fourteenth, 'Almighty and everlasting God, give unto us the increase of faith, hope, and charity.' It is this faithfulness to the ancient forms that produces the beauty of the Prayer Book. When Cranmer ventured into original composition this severe simplicity is lost.

Later compositions have departed still further from the primitive models, and for these reasons: (1) They are too informative; (2) they are too verbose; (3) they are too closely concerned with the particular. The climax of futility was reached during the Boer War, when a prayer was used containing the words, 'We believe that our cause is just.' One of the outstanding weaknesses of the proposed book of 1928/9 was its obsession with the particular. Such information as it is necessary to give to a congregation about the particular subject of any prayer can be given in the form of a simple Bidding. Otherwise the relation with God will be replaced by an informative discursus to the worshippers.

[4] I owe these illustrations to Rashdall's *Christus in Ecclesia.*

In that connection we may ask what is the relation of prayer to the Eucharist. The one significance that all would probably be prepared to give to the Eucharist is that it is a mode of pursuing and developing friendship with Jesus, a perpetuation in the Christian fellowship of that association with Him which the first Christians found in reconstructing the scene of the Last Supper. Clearly no better setting could be found for the availing prayer in Christ. Further, it is the Christian act of sacrifice in which we offer ourselves as the instruments of God's service, the only answer to prayer that really matters. 'Here we offer and present unto Thee ourselves, our souls, and bodies.' In the course of time other elements in the Eucharist were emphasized. Its whole aspect was altered by the doctrine of a localized Presence and by the interpretation of the sacrifice as the offering of Christ rather than of the Christian. In the Church of England the element of prayer is prominent, but it largely obscured by a subconscious impression that the service is partly addressed to the congregation. A phrase like 'Take and eat this in remembrance, etc.,' coming at an important point is unfortunate, because it cannot fail to give the impression that the Eucharist is a dramatic sermon for the edification of the faithful rather than a dramatized prayer in which the faithful are lifted up to God through their association with Jesus.

There are more grounds than is sometimes realized for those who complain that the Book of Common Prayer is built on the idea that devotion is only a kind of sermon. Hence it is easier to understand the motives of those who try to evade the difficulty by muttering the service inaudibly or by muffling it in lumps of the Latin Missal. At the same time Englishmen cannot probably be called adepts at prayer. It may well be that Cranmer understood his fellow-countrymen better than his successors can claim to do.

The last problem is the relation of prayer to work. By work we may understand self-expression on the human plane. Some mediaeval wit once said, '*Laborare est orare*,' as an excuse for not saying his prayers; to which the idle monk replied, 'That's the same as saying *Orare est Laborare*.' This is an instance of the logical fallacy called the Undistributed Middle, for the aphorism can hardly mean that all work is identical with all

prayer. What it must mean is that some work, namely, work related to God, that is, work done absolutely disinterestedly, lifts us Godward and makes our lives God-conscious even as prayer does.

But would anyone claim that prayer was a substitute for work? Prayer will be a prelude to work, a harmony behind work, an incentive to work. But prayer cannot be a substitute for work. And this may well be because of the nature of God and man. Men are sovereign powers like God, and ultimately are self-moved. The expression of themselves in the last resort depends upon the activity of their whole being, thought, emotion, and conation. But, they are localized. This can hardly be said of God, and probably there we shall look for the difference between God and man. Human self-expression therefore must be in Space-Time and not in Thought only, that is outside of Space-Time.

Outside of Space-Time no doubt prayer is identical with work. 'He spake and it was done; he commanded and they were created.' But this seems to be the difficulty already noticed in reference to Intercession. If we men were in some measure or in some way God, we should have to admit that external prayer had the effect and produced the result of work. But inasmuch as we are not God, we cannot will the Good and thereby make it be. We can will the Good only as a preliminary to an actual time-process of making it be. Therefore prayer with no action to follow would seem to be no more than devotional self-indulgence.

Our prayers, that is to say, must recognize two facts about Man. First Man is different from God, because he, unlike God, is localized. Consequently the prayer that will remove physical mountains will need to be implemented by action on the physical plane. Secondly, Man is like God, and therefore behind his action on the physical plane he can lift up his aspiration and will into another dimension, where God is his peer. But if he is true to his dual nature, Man will not naturally pray without working, nor will he, as he is more easily tempted to do, work without praying.

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM AND INFALLIBILITY

By the Reverend J. S. Bezzant, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College and Vice-Principal of Ripon Hall, Oxford.

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM contains two distinguishable elements: the Liberal (or Modernist) and the Conservative (or Traditional). Of the latter, a section is definitely Romanist in mentality and aim. The recognition of these distinctions is of fundamental importance to all members of the Church of England. There is indeed a 'new spirit in Anglo-Catholicism.' It is revealed, not in the introduction of novel elements, but in a more deliberate facing of facts and a new plainness of speech regarding them. The causes have been in operation for some time and are doubtless manifold; but without further analysis it may safely be said that the activities of the Roman Church, and a number of not unimportant secessions, have not wholly failed of their effect. Fr. Vernon, a man of deep personal religion, of which he could speak unaffectedly and with simplicity, was one of the most successful of contemporary mission preachers. When he became Mr. Vernon Johnson, Anglo-Catholics could not ignore his secession. He put forth 'An Explanation,'[1] which is reported to have considerably strengthened the influence of his example.[2] In itself, this book is noteworthy for its sincerity and extreme simplicity, and for nothing else. Its interest lies in the fact that it records the method and steps by which, *while yet an Anglo-Catholic*, he reached the point at which submission to Rome became inevitable.

It was as necessary as it was inevitable that Anglo-Catholicism should not ignore this challenge. The reply could hardly have been more effectively made than in the little book[3] by Mr.

[1] *One Lord, One Faith.* Sheed and Ward. Price 3/6 and 2/6.

[2] The book has been a best seller. My own copy (of the 2/6 edition) is one of the *Eleventh impression* issued between October, 1929, and January, 1930.

[3] *One God and Father of All.* A. R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd. Price 3/6 and 2/6. I should wish to endorse the opinion of Mr. Arnold Lunn that Anglo-Catholics could not do better than distribute this book in thousands among their fellows.

Milner-White and Mr. Wilfred Knox, both of Cambridge. In answering Mr. Johnson they had an extremely easy task. His extensive use of Holy Scripture is Fundamentalist[4] and his arguments, as his Anglo-Catholic critics say, 'could mean nothing at all to a well educated modern, even were he sympathetic.' But Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox have done much more than reply to Mr. Johnson. Their work is a most frank exposition of the principles of the Liberal section within Anglo-Catholicism, an outspoken expression of 'the new spirit.' Anyone who wishes to know where Liberal Anglo-Catholics stand in regard to the Roman and kindred conceptions of Authority as a ground of religious belief will find an unequivocal answer in their book. They regard Mr. Johnson's apologetic for Infallibility as so feeble that its refutation would be useless as against any scholarly Roman Catholic. They therefore substitute their own far stronger statement of the Roman case and give their reasons

> 'for rejecting the Roman position completely except in so far as anything but a primacy of honour is claimed for the See of Rome.'

They point out the well-known fact that the actual text of the Vatican Council's definition of Infallibility does not necessarily compel belief in Infallibility at all:

> 'If you choose not to believe that our Lord willed that His Church should be endowed with any infallibility whatsoever, then you can accept the definition.'[5]

It is obvious that neither in intention nor in operation does the definition permit of such casuistical treatment. But it is absolutely true that there is no *certainty* that any particular Papal pronouncement is to be regarded as infallible. The 'more cautious and scholarly' defenders of infallibility will 'almost certainly' regard the definition of the Immaculate Conception and also the *Tome* of Leo as infallible, but

> 'In both cases, the only reason for holding that either pronouncement was an infallible one, uttered *ex cathedra*, is that the great majority of Roman Catholic theologians think that it was. And unfortunately, since Roman Catholic theologians are not infallible, you have no guarantee of the infallibility of either pronouncement' (p. 67).

[4] Even the 'false ending' of St. Mark's Gospel is quoted as indubitably recording genuine sayings of the risen Lord. The marvel is that, with such an absolute ignorance of the modern study of the Bible, he should have found an Anglican Bishop to ordain him.

[5] *One God and Father of All*, p. 66. The page references throughout, unless otherwise stated, are to this book.

An infallible decree which is never used, and which cannot be known to have been used until everyone has agreed that it has been, is really useless.

> 'To Anglo-Catholics, worried with modern difficulties, an Infallible Authority sounds attractive. But when you come to the sphere of theology you find that the activities of the Infallible Authority in coping with them are not very much help, *for the simple reason that it has never dealt with them*' (p. 68).

It cannot, because it dare not: the risk of being proved wrong is too great. The writers recall the shock which the discoveries of Darwin gave to established religion, and the use made of them in attacks upon Christianity:

> '*But the Infallible Voice of the Church ought to have been able to declare precisely in what sense, if any, the old view of the Bible must be altered. It has never done so.* Instead, the assertion that the Bible, being of divine authorship, contains no errors of any kind has been repeated by two Popes, and it is left to Roman Catholic scholars to explain these utterances as best they can, by finding some sense in which such passages as the ages of the patriarchs or the story of the Flood can be said to be true, at whatever cost of that special pleading which disgusts candid minds' (p. 103).[6]

Infallibility, though in reality meaningless, is in practice very effective in suppressing all freedom of thought and belief. The Pope's authority, until known to be in any particular instance infallible, belongs to his 'ordinary authority,'[7] which is admittedly liable to err. And in practice, the coerciveness which would properly attach to an infallible authority is attached to this 'ordinary authority.'

> 'It is an authority which the faithful are bound to obey in practice, although they need not in the last resort be internally convinced of its truth' (p. 70).

This useful expedient, while it can obviously cover Papal errors, is all that remains to rely upon for those who desire an infallible authority.

In their choice of a clear instance of Papal error, the Cambridge writers are very effective. The conscience of civilized

[6] In the *Church Times* of January 24th, 1930, Mr. Milner White and Mr. Knox point out that had infallibility '*in the most restricted sphere conceivable* existed,' a word spoken at the time of the Darwinian controversies would have saved disasters to faith right and left. Its failure renders it quite unimportant whether the doctrine be accepted or not, 'for it is meaningless.'

[7] It is a pity that the authors did not refer to the origin of this convenient distinction.

mankind has condemned religious presecution as always evil, but 'The history of persecution shows that in the sphere of morals the Church and her rulers erred for centuries' (p. 79).

Yet modern Romans have defended the Church's right to put heretics to death, for if this right be conceded, the Church has demonstrably erred. Moreover,

'It was the Papacy that was in power when the use of force to extirpate heresy began' (p. 75).

Other religious bodies copied the Papal example. But all other religious societies may nowadays legitimately urge various extenuating circumstances, and confess their error, but a Church which appeals to men with a divine authority which cannot err, dare not plead in this way.

The dilemma is inescapable. Infallibility, if used at all, must be absolute. Proved erroneous at any point, its character changes fundamentally, that is, it is no longer infallible. If it is never used, and so in theory preserved from error, it is a useless encumbrance, except as a means of repression.

Whatever justification there may have been, or may still be, for charges of 'Romanizing' against Anglo-Catholics, it is doubtful if any Modernist has more emphatically repudiated the acknowledged corner-stone of Roman Catholicism than the writers of *One God and Father of All.*

It may be claimed and admitted that only an insignificant section of Anglo-Catholics has ever toyed with infallibility in its Roman form, and that their movement as a whole has consistently repudiated it. Nevertheless it is equally true that among a far larger number, the proper emphasis laid upon the authority of the Church has steadily increased to a degree which is only reasonable if that authority be really infallible. Thus 'the infallibility of the Church' has been and still is maintained as against that of the Pope. The *Church Times* nowadays stands for such infallibility:

'It is the Church to which this characteristic is ascribed . . . The sphere of its freedom from liability to mistakes is the doctrine with which it is entrusted. The Infallibility of the Church is based on its own supernatural qualities as a Divinely created, spirit-bearing institution.'[8]

Now the authors of *One God and Father of All* (and it is the real significance of their work) recognize that this doctrine is as

[8] January 31st, 1930.

indefensible and as useless as that of Rome. Accordingly *they repudiate emphatically the idea of infallibility in whatever form.* The following quotations might have been taken from the *Modern Churchman.* The writers speak of

> 'a very fashionable craze for an infallible authority to stifle every conceivable doubt in the field of religion. And it is a craze which will end in depriving the Church of all authority whatsoever; for it will deprive her of all means for commending her teaching to the mind of man' (p. 105).
>
> 'The only authority in the Catholic Church which can ultimately preserve the truth is the power of the Holy Ghost to guide theologians in the end to a true understanding of the Faith. It is only the continued labour of human thought that will ever solve any difficulty in the present, just as it is the only authority that has solved difficulties in the past' (p. 100).
>
> 'The worst religious and moral chaos that ever threatened it (the Church) was in the first two centuries, when the various heresies classed together under the name of Gnosticism, were met by the Church and eliminated without either a Pope or a General Council' (p. 81).
>
> 'Most Roman controversialists and some Anglo-Catholics write of "private judgment" as if it were a peculiarly wicked form of the sin of pride, whereas in fact it is inevitable that it should be that ultimate authority within ourselves, which answers to the ultimate authority from outside ourselves, the Person of our Lord' (p. 84).
>
> 'What finally causes men and women to believe in the Christian Faith is the fact that they find in Him something which claims at once their love, obedience, and worship' (p. 82), and this 'only because their own private judgment accepts Him as supplying what they need' (p. 83).

Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox state, with equal emphasis, that no claim to doctrinal infallibility, whether of Church or Pope, finds any more support in the New Testament than elsewhere in history or reason. Whatever the nature of the Divine guidance of the original Apostles, it demonstrably did not amount to infallibility:

> 'If the teaching of the Apostles was clear and definite about any single point, it was the imminence of the Second Coming of our Lord to judge both the quick and the dead' (p. 39),

and they draw the inevitable conclusion that the Divine guidance of the Apostles did not 'save them from an error on a matter of great practical and doctrinal importance' (p. 40).

> 'Even in the New Testament we see the doctrines of the Church changing; and the same process of development goes on all through history . . . We must make it clear that the whole conception of a Church which has been entrusted with a fixed set of doctrines and an oracular authority to interpret them is utterly without support in the New Testament' (p. 45).

The duty of the Christian scholar

> 'is not interpret a fixed set of dogmas by the help of an infallible oracle, but to seek a fuller understanding of the meaning of the revelation of God in the Person of our Lord and to interpret Him in the thought and language of his own age' (pp. 44 f).

It must not be thought that these familiar judgments are at present accepted by Anglo-Catholics generally. The *Church Times*[9] described the reply of Mr. Milner-Smith and Mr. Knox to Fr. Vernon as 'disappointing and maybe harmful,' and registered a confirmation of that judgment when the *Times Literary Supplement*[10] made the comment which will certainly have been in our readers' minds:

> 'After this it hardly seems worth while to argue about the word Modernist,'

and described the contentions of the Cambridge writers as

> 'the only arguments by which Christianity can hope to commend itself to thoughtful people.'[11]

The *Church Times* criticism was largely of the well-established type which says that if such arguments are accepted, the Christian Faith loses all security, and the Modernists may after all be right.[12] Such criticism is not reasoning at all and it is irrelevant to the question of the truth of what Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox have written. Nor is the criticism in itself even half-true. In no other human activity is it supposed that reliability and sufficient guidance for life are non-existent without infallibility: why should it be otherwise in religion within which the Divine guidance is operative? In every other human activity the Divine education of man has proceeded through and by the inclusion of what, from a more advanced standpoint, has to be acknowledged as error. History tells the same story of religion and morals. Reason and conscience, exercised with due regard to the judgments of Christian reason and conscience in the past and to the similar judgments of the Christian community in the present, are all that we have to guide us, and they are not infallible; but

[9] It is a pleasure to acknowledge, and to inform those of our readers who do not know, that the *Church Times* has recently courteously allowed Dr. Major considerable space for a correspondence about *The Incarnation of the Word* and to reply to criticisms. [10] December 19th, 1929. [11] *Ibid.*

[12] It is regrettable that the *Church Times* should, in this connection, still refer to 'the Modernist revision of the Deity of Christ into His Divinity, meaning the purely human divinely gifted creature.' To pervert is easier than to refute.

the more they are sincerely used the less fallible they become, and the less obstructive of the Divine guidance. In reply to the criticism of the *Church Times* Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox said truly :

> 'The trouble is that some seem to think that there can be no authority without Infallibility, or that the ascription of Infallibility somehow strengthens authority. We maintain, on the contrary, that Infallibility obscures and damages the living Authority of the Church.'[13]

They cite, while recognizing its limitations, the analogy of science, and maintain that the fact of Christ renders the Church's authority greater than that of science; but they say that

> 'no one yields such deference to the Authority of the Church as to the authority of science in general, or to some particular branch of it, such as medicine.'

The *Church Times* criticism of this is of the kind for which that paper is notorious :

> 'The parallel is, indeed, inconsistent and misleading. It is inconsistent, because it asserts first that the authority of the Church is far greater than that of science, and then it asserts that no one yields such deference to the authority of the former as to that of the latter.'[14]

That comment is a quibble, with only a semblance of justification in a carelessness of expression in the passage criticized. It is perfectly clear, and even clearer in its context, that the Cambridge writers mean that 'the authority of science in general' *has an infinitely greater acknowledged authority* than has the authority of the Church. That is indisputable, and the statement is in no way inconsistent with the writers' belief that the Church's authority, though really greater, is actually weakened by the unjustifiable claim that it is infallible.

The *Church Times* also made a futile attempt to repel the argument of Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox based upon the Church's use of persecution :

> 'But extensively as this evil procedure prevailed, and confidently as it was defended, yet it cannot really be fairly said that Christendom as a whole, East and West alike, has been from first to last committed to it. It cannot really be claimed as a Catholic, that is Universal, belief. It has never been part of the Faith of Christendom.'[15]

[13] *Church Times*, January 24th, 1930. They point out that thousands fall away from a Church which claims infallibility, and that on the Continent there exists an anti-Catholic and anti-Christian element both among the learned and the simple. Authority has failed to convince, and 'has driven them into violent opposition to religion of a kind almost unknown in England' (p. 101).

[14] *Church Times*, January 31st, 1930. [15] January 31st, 1930.

A more absurd and disastrous argument would be difficult to conceive. If it is legitimate to reason thus, it may always be proved, by an appeal to some section of the Church at some period of that section's history, that the Church as a whole has never been committed to anything.[16] The point is that the 'infallibility,' whether of Pope or Church, was clearly unable to prevent the Church from action which the conscience of civilized mankind condemns. If Infallibility means that the Church may err for centuries and become aware of its error through the Divine guidance operative as much or more outside the Church than within it, then indeed the infallibility of the Church may be a fact. But then the customary meaning of words has been reversed.

Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox had also guardedly maintained the possibility that the sins of man might allow the Church to fail. The *Church Times* regards this as 'a statement from which we shrink,' and as 'a view which we are entirely unable to adopt.' Nevertheless it is a fact that the reception of Divine grace does not make men sinless: the facts of history show that Divine guidance does not make them infallible. It is not the Bishop of Birmingham, but Dr. Goudge, an Anglo-Catholic who has frequently defended the position of the 'extreme' men, who writes:

> 'To say that the Holy Spirit guarantees the truth of the Church's teaching, whatever the Church's moral condition may be, is simply to say that His action is magical.' . . . 'Absolute infallibility is, as I have tried to show, for sinful men *à priori* impossible; and it is refuted *à posteriori* by the clearest facts.'[17]

It is obvious that, apart from sin, the inevitable imperfections of general knowledge, in terms of which any and every Divine revelation must find expression, make it quite impossible to claim finality for the verbal form of any doctrine. In the words of Professor Whitehead:

> 'You cannot claim absolute finality for a dogma without claiming a commensurate finality for the sphere of thought within which it arose. If the dogmas of the Christian Church from the second to the sixth centuries express finally and sufficiently the truths concerning the topics about which they deal, then the Greek philosophy of that period had developed a system of ideas of equal finality.' 'A dogma . . . can only

[16] And, if so, then the authority of the Church not only as an infallible guide, but as a guide in any sense at all, is explicitly thrown away.

[17] *Church Times*, November 29th, 1929.

> be adequate in its adjustment of certain abstract concepts. But the estimate of the status of these concepts remains for determination.'[18]

The *Church Times* accepts the infallibility of the Church in respect of the doctrinal agreements of East and West. But it is obvious that this last refuge is entirely uninhabitable. In addition to the criticisms fatal to infallibility in any form, we may add that even an universal ancient agreement about matters which had not yet become the problems they are now, or were formerly seen in a very different light, could as well betoken universal error as universal truth. It is therefore worse than useless as a criterion of infallibility, and the appeal to it as such can only be effective for the preservation of error. And further, the value of agreement depends entirely upon its nature :

> 'The faith which has impressive value for truth is that which is held by an agreement of free minds; not that held by an agreement of minds not allowed to differ' (p. 149).

This obvious consideration disallows any appeal to the West as contributing to the desired infallibility. Nor is the East so very different : no outstanding contribution to the solution of modern religious difficulties has been forthcoming from the East. Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox quite rightly point out that a few years ago the *Church Times* could have made this appeal to establish the inerrancy of Holy Scripture, a position which neither Rome nor Constantinople has yet abandoned, but which the *Church Times* now repudiates.

It was with surprise and regret that we read the passage in *One God and Father of All* in which the authors attempt to dissociate themselves from Modernism. They repudiate the common assertion that Modernism is responsible for the present unsettlement of religious belief, which they rightly attribute to 'the impact of modern science, Biblical criticism and rationalism on a religious world taken by surprise, and hampered by effete intellectual methods' (p. 21). But they also write :

> 'Modernism within the Church to-day is an over-eager, muddled, unsympathetic, but honest attempt to help doubters and to be up-to-date in the reconciliation to which we have alluded; and suffers from not knowing thoroughly either the Faith which it interprets, or the science at whose heels it runs, or the needs of the souls which it is trying to help' (p. 22).

Were we not 'unsympathetic' we might perchance be grateful for the recognition of our honesty from writers who may yet find

[18] *Religion in the Making*, pp. 130*f*.

heir own impugned. The last words in their statement and the eference to not knowing the Faith, if they are anything more han the thoughtless language of the professional pietist, are an xample of religious pharisaism. The passage as a whole, issued is a pronouncement without further explanation or defence, is an tter irrelevance in its context, and can have no weight at all xcept on the assumption that these writers are the mouthpieces f precisely that type of ecclesiastical authority which they so lainly repudiate. And while both of them have scholarly work o their account, it is not irrelevant to their professed principles o remark that neither is acknowledged as a scientist or as an xpounder of the writings of scientists; their words, even if one ooks no further than a very distinguished group of scholars in heir own University who do not disclaim the name Modernist, re mere insolence. In the *Church Times*[19] also they have said hat if Modernism means 'the attitude in theology represented y the Modern Churchmen's Union, then we are not Modern-sts,' the reason being that 'we believe that their conclusions' re in many respects wrong. Observe the careless *non sequitur*. They dissent from an '*attitude in theology*,' and in giving their eason for doing so *substitute dissent from certain unspecified conclusions*.' Modernists, as many as have spoken, have in-isted to the point of weariness that Modernism is an attitude in heology and *not* a body of conclusions, being in fact quite con-istent with varying conclusions. The present writer could not ish to see that attitude set forth more clearly and more definitely han it is by Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox. Do they wish to elong to that sorry hybrid class of 'anti-Modernist Modernists' ho repudiate an 'attitude in theology' which it needs a mag-ifying glass of quite exceptional power to distinguish from their wn? Yet withal, those who are called Modernists will not be ver-anxious to identify words with facts. The elder among hem have done much to bring the Church of England out of n uninhabitable Egypt, and if others lead and enter into the Pro-ised Land it will be a familiar story. It is their efforts which ave made it possible for our anti-Modernist Modernists to write s they have done without having to meet, from their own fellow-hurchmen, accusations of spiritual blindness, irreligious ration-lism, and treachery to Christ. Modernists may even recognize

[19] January 24th, 1930.

that the Liberal Catholics' disclaimer of Modernism is almost essential if they are to have any influence with thousands of Anglo-Catholics to whom Modernism is a bogey.

It is more important to note that Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox are not voices crying in a wilderness of obscurantist Anglo-Catholicism. Anglo-Catholic criticisms of their opinions have been few and futile : approval has been quite general and wholehearted. The Editor of *Theology* writes of their work that

> 'it has served to bring matters to a head and to clear up a situation which had been let drift for too long,'

and describes their main argument against 'Infallibility and the whole conception of authority which goes with it' as 'simply devastating.' He says that what Christ has promised to His Church is not infallibility, but

> '"sufficient light i' the dark to rise by"; and this we have because the Church is guided by the Holy Spirit,' but 'we have not got, and cannot have, anywhere in this life the absolute truth on any subject.'[20]

The Green Quarterly, another Anglo-Catholic magazine, says that

> 'the major issue which will determine the future of the Movement is the kind of mentality which it is likely to develop . . . This lies at the root of the problems which may arise as a result of the Lambeth Conference . . . Nothing seems to us more important than the creation of a progressive, liberal-minded Catholicism, which will face these problems, not in a petty controversial spirit, but with an intelligence which will judge these and other questions on their merits. To state this more frankly, we are convinced that the Movement, if it is to be a main influence upon modern thought, must rid itself of what we would describe as the "Roman mind."' There is a place for conservatism, 'but it will be a disaster if this element becomes, or remains, the preponderating influence.'

And Dr. Goudge states frankly :

> 'If Anglo-Catholics are to make any appeal to the mind of England to-day they must get rid of this false doctrine of the infallibility of the Church.'[21]

There is thus much more than 'the sound of a going in the tops of the mulberry trees' : it is rather 'the sound of an abundance

[20] *Theology*, February, 1930. To describe the belief in the Church's guidance by the Holy Spirit, Mr. Selwyn prefers the term 'Indefectibility,' and Mr. Milner-White and Mr. Knox are favourably disposed to that description. It is sincerely to be hoped that Liberal Anglo-Catholics will have no truck with it. The word is hideous, and not easy to distinguish from infallibility. It belongs to the category to which the Cambridge writers refer when they say : 'We are dooming theology to contempt if we persist in employing gigantic terms in an arbitrary or incomprehensible manner.'

[21] *Church Times*, November 29th, 1929.

f rain.' As the *Times Literary Supplement* said of *One God nd Father of All*,

> 'The significance of this striking book is that it comes from the Anglo-Catholic wing. The arguments employed, when fully grasped, will be destructive of much that goes by that name.'[22]

Who can doubt it? Consider, for example, the implications of ıe following passage in its bearings on certain controversies herein the evidence, for what we may call the Anglo-Catholic osition, is either very shaky or patient of more than one interretation :

> 'We cannot refrain from raising the question whether it is really possible for those who have not learnt an unquestioning acceptance of traditional religion, whether Catholic or Protestant, to believe that the God Whose work in creation extends to the infinite realms of space and time revealed to us by modern knowledge is really so keenly interested in questions of ecclesiastical organization, however important' (pp. 29 f).[23]

It is clear that Anglo-Catholics are coming to realize, what Iodernists have emphasized for a generation, that there is either need nor justification for a Church which is but a pale eflection of Rome. No Church which adopts an attenuated verion of Roman Catholicism, something in essence the same, ostering the same mentality, adopting a kindred conception of clesiastical authority, and maintaining an invertebrate attitude face of the Roman claims, can ever hope to flourish side by de with Rome. The lesser will be absorbed by the greater, for can meet no human need which Rome cannot more adequately tisfy. Such a type of Anglo-Catholicism will remain an imeded movement, and individuals who accept it, when they come ce to face with Rome, will continue to get over, round or under e obstacles to the only logical, if illusory, conclusion. For ourlves, we not only welcome 'the new spirit in Anglo-Catholism,' but if it becomes characteristic of the Movement, we shall joice to see its name, together with that of Modernism, replaced ' 'Anglicanism,' for the historical reality of that name will have vaked out of sleep. The task of the Liberal Anglo-Catholics, ough gigantic, is by no means hopeless, and Modernists will e careful not to cramp nor to hinder this new spirit of life in the hurch of England.

[22] December 19th, 1929.

[23] In dealing with the difficult subject of Birth Control the authors conclude : *'Do not let us pretend that we have an infallible voice, when the real truth is that we have a religious body which can be relied on to change as slowly as possible'* (p. 123).

A STATEMENT BY DR. BARNES

The Bishop of Birmingham has issued the following statement :—

I THINK that at the present time I ought to explain, for the sake of many who are puzzled by legal arguments and proceedings, what has led up to the recent action brought against me in the Chancery Division of the High Court by the Patronage Trustees of St. Aidan's, Birmingham.

When I became Bishop of Birmingham in 1924 I knew that the most serious of the problems before me was how to end ecclesiastical disorder in the Diocese. The erroneous sacramental teaching of the Roman Church was so thoroughly accepted by a small but vocal section of the clergy that I was actually rebuked for referring to the errors of Latin sacramentalism in my Enthronement Address. The disunion within the Church weakened its moral authority in Birmingham; the prevalence of false sacramental teaching alienated thoughtful and educated people. Obviously sound Anglican teaching was needed; and, gradually, illegal services copied from Roman Catholicism had to be made to cease.

To provide sound teaching was easy, in part because the strength of the Liberal and Evangelical movements in the Church at large has grown steadily during recent years. To get a general obedience to the Prayer Book was a harder matter.

I went slowly. I did not, even after a year's delay, ask that the practice of reservation should cease altogether, because it was not then known how far reservation 'for the sick only' might be sanctioned by the Church and Parliament. But in November 1925 I demanded that *public* reservation of the consecrated elements of Holy Communion should cease and that also such Roman usages as Benediction, Adoration and Procession of the Host should be brought to an end. Most of the clergy showed friendly loyalty; but some fifteen churches refused my request and formed the so-called 'rebel' group. What was I to do with them? The incumbents concerned were undoubtedly acting illegally, in defiance of the solemn Declaration of Assent which each had taken before being admitted to his living. Each

ad sworn canonical obedience to his Bishop, in all things law-
ul and honest, and was consequently false to his oath. Of
ourse, I could have taken legal action against each. At the cost
n every case of a very considerable sum I could have had the
ncumbent removed from his living. In the struggle his lawyers
ight, and probably would, have so arranged matters that he
ent to prison for contempt of court. Such proceedings, to say
ne least, would have been unedifying. But, apart from lesser
onsiderations, I could not bring myself to quell religious dis-
rder and enforce moral obligations by 'going to law.' So I
esolved both to give no countenance to the so-called 'rebel'
hurches and also to refuse to institute new vicars, when vacan-
ies occurred, unless I had an understanding from the men pre-
ented to me that they regarded their Declaration and Oaths as
inding obligations.

There was always the possibility that some patron, eager to
erpetuate disorder, would tell his nominee to refuse to give
uch an understanding: and that the patron would then bring
n action against me. I resolved that I would not defend such
n action if it should be brought: the issue would be really
oral and spiritual. As Bishop I ought to be able to preserve
ound doctrine and to get order without fighting legal actions.
f I cannot, Parliament must ultimately intervene: and, if I
uffer for my principles, Parliament will not be indifferent.

I confess that I did not expect that a responsible body of
nglo-Catholic patronage trustees, including a Diocesan
ishop, would abandon the old High Church doctrine of the
piritual independence of the Church and appeal to the lay
ourts. Such action aims, in fact, at forcing me to allow reser-
ation at St. Aidan's although Parliament, by a vote popular
ithin and without the Church, refused to legalize reservation
oth in 1927 and again in 1928.

In answer to overtures which have reached me I have said
at reservation at St. Aidan's must cease. If the Patronage
rustees or their Presentee are willing to assure me that reser-
ation shall cease, I will proceed to institute at once. Failing
ich an understanding, whatever the consequences, I must con-
nue to refuse institution.

In this event undoubtedly the Trustees can go again to the
hancery Division of the High Court. If their appeal caused

me to be sent to prison I should without complaint thus serve the cause of Reformed religion.

I wish it to be understood that, in refusing to permit reservation at St. Aidan's, I am not only respecting the decision of Parliament but I am also protesting against the error that a spiritual presence can be attached to, or inhere in, inert matter. This error runs through primitive religion and is common in lower forms of faith. The Church of England repudiated all ideas of this kind at the Reformation. The present difficulties of Bishops, elsewhere than in Birmingham, have made it clear that, if reservation be conceded as an administrative convenience, doctrines akin to transubstantiation will be taught, and devotions to a spiritual presence assumed to be associated with the consecrated elements will be arranged. My earnest desire is to prevent the lodgment of such doctrines and practices within the English Church lest the faith we profess becomes contaminated. It is essential to our continued well-being as a Church that we should preserve a faith worthy to hold the intellectual, no less than the moral, respect of the English people.

BOOK REVIEWS

HUMAN THOUGHT AND BEHAVIOUR*

A history of man from the dawn of his human mentality to the age when his emancipation from the tyranny of superstition was promoted by the Ionian Greeks in the sixth century B.C. involves a survey so vast and comprehensive that few writers are equipped sufficiently well to undertake it. If it had to be undertaken by a single writer, as no doubt it had, the task could hardly have been committed to one better qualified for it than Prof. G. Elliot Smith, who is equally eminent as an Anatomist, an Ethnologist, a Craniologist, and an Egyptologist. Collaboration, as we have reason to know, is not always happy or successful. It requires one mind to maintain continuity and consistency, to see things steadily and see them whole. Whatever faults therefore may be found with Professor Elliot Smith's latest book,* it has the charm of telling a well co-ordinated story. Is it true that similar physical conditions produce similar results in the invention of the civilized arts and crafts? Can we really trace the gradual evolution of social and religious institutions in the customs, rites and ceremonies of savages? Is it true to say that warfare is instinctive and natural for primitive man, and so for all men? Is the widespread tradition of a Golden Age in the distant past devoid of any historical foundation and nothing but an empty dream? Is the tradition of a Fall quite contrary to fact? These are some of the questions put by Professor Elliot Smith in his latest discussions of human thought and behaviour. And they are answered in a way that will arrest the attention of thoughtful readers and startle those who cling to current views about the history of man. If the author of this book is right,

* *Human History.* By G. Elliot Smith. (Jonathan Cape, Ltd.: 1930. pp. 509. 21/- net.)

the main elements of culture were produced in one place, and then diffused throughout the world; the customs, rites, and ceremonies of savages are for the most part the degenerate offspring of a certain kind of imported culture; the true primitive is a peaceful and innocuous person who lives a life which ever remains simple and unenterprising; the tradition of a Golden Age is historical; and the Fall or lapse into a state of decadence actually took place.

According to Professor Elliot Smith, many of our current ideas about human thought and behaviour are urgently in need of revision. If this be so, it is important for every individual to take account of what he says. It is particularly important for theologians as well as for others who have at heart the pursuit of truth and the betterment of mankind to weigh well his words. There will no doubt be readers who will question his evidence and reject his conclusions. In any case, with the best will in the world it is not easy to turn a mental somersault. But even supposing that the arguments on the main thesis are not accepted, there is so much in this book that is arresting, illuminating, stimulating, and, as the Germans say, path-breaking; there is so much that inspires sympathy with the aspirations of the past and hope for the achievements of the future that anyone who reads to the end can hardly fail to be rewarded.

The book is dedicated to William James Perry 'as a tribute of admiration of his vision and courage,' and the Preface pays tribute to his 'brilliant researches.' This whole-hearted recognition and appreciation of the work and genius of a younger man is characteristic of Professor Elliot Smith. Incidentally, it is one of the proofs of his own large-mindedness.

Manchester University. M. A. CANNEY.

YOUR PARISH HISTORY.*

It is no doubt a counsel of perfection that every country incumbent of a small parish should search out and write its history. It is a task the discharge of which would be good for both people and priest. The priest would find his parish growing in interest for himself and his sympathies expanding as he realized something of the conditions, methods, and characters of the men who had preceded him in his post. He would also find that at least one influential means of attracting men to the Church as a divine society is to attract them to the local church edifice, especially if it be ancient and beautiful, as in so many cases it is in rural England.

Mr. Barron's guide to the writing of a parish history is eminently useful. He does not favour parish histories which 'are commonly compiled from printed books, such as county histories, the statements in which are taken on trust.' 'Archaeology,' he maintains, 'is useless, unless the certainty of things is the ideal before the writer. The historian must give his authorities.' An accurate account and well-documented is what the parish historian should aim at. Moreover, he ought, as far as possible, to present his record in the precise words of his documents and not in generalized statements of his own. In order to write an English parish history the author must know Latin (Norman-French and Old English or Anglo-Saxon documents he can get translated for him), and he must also know how to decipher the scripts of mediaeval and Tudor scribes. These accomplishments are well within the range of the country parson. He ought also to become a member of the local archaeological society.

Mr. Barron's book gives an excellent introduction to all the main sources which may be searched for contributions to a parish history. He

* *Your Parish History*. By H. M. Barron, B.A. Oxon. (Publ. Wells, Gardner, Darton & Co.: 1930. Price 3/6.)

seems to us, however, to need to supplement his instruction in various directions. He omits all reference to tithe-maps and parish terriers which often preserve the ancient names of the fields of parishes. Although our author deals with the inventories of church goods, he has no special section on church plate and its investigation; nor has he anything about church glass. Directions for the study of church architecture and church furniture, and some account of the most reliable authorities in these departments, are also lacking. Something also should be said about ancient roads and rights of way, especially in relation to parochial boundaries.

There is one point more. Many country parsons are very poor, and it would be well to give, if possible, the precise charges they may expect to incur for searches, transcriptions, and translations from the public and the diocesan records.

We do not wish to give the impression that we do not think Mr. Barron's book an excellent one. It is so good that we wish to see it approach even nearer to perfection.

H.D.A.M.

DOGMA IN HISTORY AND THOUGHT.*

Dogma, like some other necessary things, has a bad name. Its necessity has multiplied opportunities for its perversion. It may encourage some to read a valuable book if it is said at once that three of these seven essays contribute a very interesting exposition of what Christian Dogma has tried to accomplish, at the great 'moments' of its history—in the Early Church, in Medieval and in Protestant Scholasticism; or, if we enlarge the idea of Dogma a little, it may be said that six of the essays give an outline of the idea of Dogma as operative in Christian doctrinal history. Indeed, the main connections between the various essays are supplied by history rather than by their actual contents. In a book like the present one this was inevitable, not because of the lack of unity inseparable from a collective work by men whose points of view are far from identical, but rather on account of the material actually supplied by an examination of the dogmatic idea in its historical operation. The 'Histories of Dogma' owe much of their unity to the fact that the selected subject-matter has passed through the single mind of the author of a particular book, but they do not often bring out clearly the changes in the *idea* and in the *accent* in dogmatic theology. It was well worth while to publish this book of lectures by the staff of King's College, London. It should do much to dispel the very natural prejudice against dogma which many thoughtful persons entertain.

'The Nature and Basis of Dogma' is expounded by Dr. Matthews. The process of dogmatic development necessarily begins as soon as the Gospel is made to appeal to the mind of any age by the use of current science and philosophy. Dogma in religion differs from the dogmas of a philosophical school in that it presupposes Revelation, of which it is an interpretation and defence: it is 'the explication of a datum.' Herein lies the modern difficulty, namely, how it is possible to recognize in a dogma what is datum and what is explication. The difficulty exists even in the Gospels: the datum cannot be contemplated in a pure state, for we can never so isolate it. Interpretation is present in every act of perception. 'The ultimate source of the Christian religion and of Christian dogma is the experience of Jesus Himself,' nevertheless 'The Messianic consciousness is to some degree dependent upon the fact that the Messianic idea was already in existence.' Therefore, while no catalogue of current religious ideas can ever explain Jesus, even so 'at the fountain head of Christian faith and life,'

* *Dogma in History and Thought.* Studies by Various Writers. Edited by the Rev. W. R. Matthews, D.D., Dean of King's College, London. (Nisbet & Co., Ltd. Price 8/6.)

ve cannot find datum without interpretation.' Religious truth is in its nature ymbolical, whether the symbolism be concrete or abstract; 'and it is oubtful, to say the least, whether any judgment which we can form on any ubject whatever is absolutely true in the sense that a knowledge of the hole of reality would leave it unmodified.' Again, 'The language of reli- ious devotion is pure poetry: the language of theology is the symbolism f religion intellectualized, but not made completely abstract.' Scientific nowledge is also symbolical, though it admits of a kind of verification not ossible for other knowledge. The difference does not alter the fact that oth are to be judged by experience. 'A theory which conflicts with ex- erience cannot stand,' and dogmatic formulation may change and pro- ress. This, and more, is set out in Dr. Matthews' lecture with the lucidity hich is characteristic of him.

Dr. E. J. Bicknell, apparently accepting Dr. Matthews' principles, deals ith 'Dogma in the New Testament.' The dogmatic passages in the New estament are not 'scientifically precise,' having less affinity with scientific an with moral and aesthetic judgments. They try to say something which e plain man will be able to grasp. Certain statements, *e.g.* the Pauline hristological passage in *Philippians*, are best described as 'mythological,' f we can only get rid of the idea that what is mythological is purely aginative, and bears no relation to truth and fact,' and if the description not made dangerous by 'attempts to invest it with the kind of truth that does not attempt to attain.' The moral and religious judgments of the ew Testament are more permanent than strictly philosophical or scientific dgments would have been, for they are more akin to those judgments hich all men must pass upon the world. They remain as material for ientific theology. This lecture would prove illuminating to those whose sk it is to teach the New Testament to ordinary thoughtful people, with e regard to modern study.

In thirty pages on 'Dogma in the New Testament' Bishop Gore con- nses in admirable fashion his well-known and oft-published ideas upon e subject. There is, he says, development in theology, but not in dogma. e New Testament dogma is a substantial unity: within it there is no velopment of real significance. It is obvious that Dr. Gore can draw the e between datum and explication in revelation with greater clearness than r. Matthews. Age seems to increase the Bishop's power of clear exposi- n, and this, combined with his deep religious insight, gives to all his iting a value not to be measured by the reader's agreement with it.

To lecture on 'Dogma in Protestant Scholasticism' Dr. R. S. Franks, incipal of Western College, Bristol, was selected, and the result is a rned and candid exposition, necessarily all too brief, of a period of ought known to most people only by perversions of it. Dr. Franks does t over-credit that to which he is favourably disposed by his own denomi- tional allegiance. Protestant Scholasticism was a 'secondary pheno- non' important as an adaptation of old principles to new uses, and of eat value to the Continental Protestant Churches, 'but not comparable th the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages.' Dr. Franks divides and dis- sses his subject: (*a*) its groundwork, its doctrine of God and of the world,) its restatement of the dogmas of the Trinity and the Incarnation, and the Augustinian anthropology, and (*c*) the new theology of the Reforma- n about the Gospel, the Church and the Sacraments, the doctrine of ly Scripture (the cardinal doctrine which, with the recognition of the *timonium Spiritus Sancti* in the heart was so powerful as against Rome), d the Atonement. Dr. Franks regards this work both as revealing the e function of theology and also how absolutely essential a theology is to y and every form of Christianity. He then traces, in brief outline, the

fortunes of Protestant Scholasticism down to modern times and concludes with some pertinent observations on the general outlook from which particular Christian doctrines must be developed. King's College could not have done better than entrust this lecture to Dr. Franks.

Dr. Claude Jenkins gives a very interesting, attractively-written sketch of 'The Decline of Dogma' in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, illustrated with admirable quotations from contemporary literature. He does not tell the story and the effects of Biblical criticism, and the discoveries of the nineteenth century: it is presumed by the Editor that these will be well known to readers of the book. Dr. H. M. Relton concludes the course with a lecture on 'The Reconstruction of Dogma.' A glance at pages 181 and 199*f.* might suggest that Dr. Relton's purpose is to ask questions rather than to answer them. We do not make this captious criticism, but rather rejoice to see the real difficulties confronting the task of the reconstruction of Dogma so clearly grasped and so clearly stated. This essay certainly reveals the only spirit which will be of much constructive use in attempting the task which lies ahead of the Christian Church. Here and there we find ourselves in disagreement. Statements such as that the Christianity which can claim continuity with the past 'must contain a miraculous element' and 'The final antithesis may well prove to be this—the utter incompatibility of the miraculous with modern thought, and thus the utter impossibility of a representation of Christianity,' are neither much to the point nor full of meaning. For the problem nowadays is not a philosophical repudiation of the *à priori* possibility of the miraculous so much as the difficulty of its intelligible definition. *'Aliquid dicitur esse miraculum, quod fit praeter ordinem totius naturae creatae'* is not of much use, since the whole course of nature is not known to us. And, as Dr. Tennant has so ably argued, testimony to fact cannot reach to divine agency, and it is this that is of importance if 'miracles' are to be of any evidential or religious value. What is important for Christianity is that God is the Creator and 'ground' of creation, but not Himself 'evolving' with the creation, though immanent in it. I shall hope to examine this suggestive lecture at a later date.

I have not mentioned, in its order in the book, Mr. Richard Hanson's lecture on 'Dogma in Mediaeval Scholasticism.' His literary style makes his contribution easily the most readable in the book. None the less it is unworthy of its company. He brings out the basic importance to the Schoolmen of the distinction between Reason and Revelation, the *lumen naturale* and the *revelatio dei*. He does not vouchsafe much more than this familiar information. He might have made a useful contribution by illustrating the operation of this distinction in the Scholastic treatment of doctrines. Instead, much of his lecture is taken up with reproaches of the supposed tendency of 'perhaps nine-tenths of the professed theologians in the modern world' to attempt to explain Christianity in terms of a thorough-going Monistic philosophy, saving themselves from explaining it away entirely by bringing in, at the last moment, a little of the dualism which is anathema to the philosophy they adopt. In spite of the brilliant phraseology of this tirade, it is little more than clever fooling. Mr. Hanson seems to think that a return to the Scholastic philosophy is essential, subsequent thought having contributed nothing but insuperable difficulties to the maintenance of Christianity. But Mr. Hanson does not defend his position on any positive grounds, and theology must have something more solid to justify its acceptance of a philosophy than the fact that it would be extremely convenient to do so. As Dr. Matthews remarks in his Preface, it is easier 'to go behind Kant' than to refute him. It is the facts which make the rigid dualism of the Schoolmen unworkable. Several times in this book it is emphasized

nd shown that the attempt to mark out separate compartments for absolute nd relative is vain. What is the use of a clear distinction between revela- on and reason unless certain data of knowledge can be confidently ascribed o each, as well as to both? The distinction, if at all sharply drawn, is lmost impossible unless our point of departure in dealing with the facts the vicious one of taking first what we think the Gospel ought to be, ithout close reference to what it is. A preconceived idea of revelation xposes to the risk of rejecting the revelation should it not prove to be what as expected. Mr. Hanson's criticisms are at once too vague and too weeping to be of constructive value, even at the points where criticism is ndoubtedly necessary. He has missed his opportunity, and the negative haracter of his essay is emphasized by its position between those of Dr. ore and Dr. Franks. J. S. BEZZANT.

AN ATTEMPT AT RE-INTERPRETATION.*

Re-interpretation is a sincere and courageous attempt to present the ssentials of the Christian faith in the light of modern knowledge and odern thought. Dr. David (Bishop of Liverpool), who writes a Foreword, ys of it:—

'This book seems to me a contribution of great value to a task in which l religious thinkers ought to join, namely, that of re-interpreting the truth out God in terms of modern experience and thought . . . We live in a ew world, and we think and speak of it in a new language. But most of s have not realized yet that on this account we need renewal of our oughts and words about God. I believe that the future of religion in this untry depends largely upon the fulfilment of this task. It is not one which n be left to experts in theology or philosophy' (p. 11).

Mr. Bowden Smith is a parochial clergyman. His expositions are not ose of a scholar or an expert, but of an intelligent and thoughtful parish iest. He does not write dogmatically and he recognizes that all his views e open to revision. In his expositions of Christ's Resurrection and Ascen- on he is much influenced by the findings of psychical research. He thinks at at His Resurrection Christ exchanged a physical body for an etheric body, hich He utilized until the Ascension, when He assumed the spiritual form hich He possessed before His Incarnation. This is highly speculative, but is tter than the crudities of the old materialistic interpretations. When deal- g with the Second Coming Mr. Bowdon exhibits the influence of an ex- oded exposition of the numbers in *Daniel* and *Revelation*, and the gro- sque speculations of Piazzi Smith's interpretation of the phenomena of the reat Pyramid. Our author should study R. H. Charles' writings on Jewish ocalyptic.

Sir Oliver Lodge, who contributes a 'Commendatory Note' to the lume, states that he is 'in deep accord' with its main theme.

> 'Unity in the midst of diversity, a Continuum evolving into discontinuous units for purposes of individual development, and for the achievement of increasing value, yet all united in one great Whole: this surely lies at the root of all science and all philosophy. Even so has the ether been enriched by differentiation into localized discontinuous atoms and into the consequent worlds in space. Even so does the Universal Mind utilize the incarnating properties of matter to differentiate itself into separate personalities and manifest itself under individual forms.'

With this we are in agreement and with much else in this lucid, simple, d suggestive little volume. H.D.A.M.

* *Re-interpretation.* By W. S. Bowdon. (Publ. Skeffington's, 1930. Price 4/6.)

CORRESPONDENCE

WILL RELIGION REVIVE?

SIR,

Readers of the March number of the *Modern Churchman* will be profoundly grateful to the Rev. J. C. Hardwick for his thoughtful and constructive paper, 'Will Religion Revive?' which combines with a just, if severe, criticism of the religious situation to-day, a restrained but cheering optimism as to its future.

Perhaps the most valuable and necessary lesson of all for Modernists is that with which Mr. Hardwick concludes his paper, which is also emphasized by Mr. Lempriere's letter on 'The Way of Renewal.'

'The Modernist who palters, or is uncertain, or tries to compromise will fail, and deserves to do so.'

It is really quite extraordinary how often, together with sound Modernist teaching from the pulpit, there is combined a choice of hymns which directly negatives the teaching given, creating in the minds of the congregation a painful feeling that the preacher has failed to recognize the implications of his own professed opinions.

How is it possible for us, as Modernists, to join in hymns which speak of the Lord's Table as an 'Altar,' and the Fellowship Meal of the Church as a 'Sacrifice' knowing, as we do, the old historical associations of the idea of propitiation of an angry and avenging Deity which underlie the ceremonial sacrifice?

Or, again, can we sing hymns which imply the Evangelical or the Anglo-Catholic view of the 'Atonement,' the Virgin Birth, a pre-existent Christ, a bodily Resurrection, or hymns which are clearly Tri-theistic or which confuse the persons of the Father and the Son so as to make their status and functions practically interchangeable?

More alienation of Modernists is caused by this apparent want of consistency—as also by the use of Roman terminology by those who would certainly repudiate Roman doctrine—than, perhaps, many incumbents realize.

Thoughtful men and women to-day are sick to death of theological 'soppiness,' sometimes camouflaged as 'Christian charity,' and will agree with Mr. Hardwick that 'it is the "all or nothing" men who win the world.'

37 Eccleston Square,
London, S.W.1.

EDITH S. STIFF.

SIR,

Mr. Hardwick has written a very interesting article on Can Religion Revive? He gives an example of the present state of affairs by quoting what he saw in a little village where he spent two Sundays last August. An enterprising individual had drawn off a large section of the people by taking them on trips to the sea-side. He leaves us to infer that the spirit of enterprise was confined to this individual and not to the vicar. Does not this supply a parable? Surely in order to have 'a revival of religion' the spirit of enterprise must be more in evidence in the Church. It is easy of course to damn such enterprise by speaking of it as 'stunts,' but even 'stunts' require courage and hard work, and intellectual effort along novel lines—things opposed to the deadly routine which does so much to kill religious or any other life.

The more people are educated and begin to think and act for themselves, the more they will reject routine and the more necessary it will be to display enterprise. Enterprise can be of all sorts, merely to catch the crowd, which

what I believe the Story of the Temptation is essentially meant to con-
emn, or along the noble lines which our Lord pursued in His life.

It is not for me to suggest what enterprise the vicar of that country parish
ight have shown and which would at least have indicated that he possessed
at quality in as great a degree as did his commercial rival, but the village
perhaps a microcosm of the world.

Mr. Hardwick goes on to say that the religious instinct, the instinct to
evote oneself to something larger and worthier than oneself, will seek
atisfaction, and the question remains whether the Church will be able to
ovide satisfaction for that religious need as it is now felt. After a con-
derable experience in different parts of the world, I have come to one cer-
in conclusion—that the average man's difficulty with regard to religion is
ot intellectual, but due to a failure on the part of his spiritual guides to find
n adequate channel along which he can give expression to his religious
stinct. That is to say, the average Englishman is pragmatic and not intel-
ctual. We have heard a great deal about the reform of the Prayer Book,
it we have not yet seen the Bishops and the Church Assembly and the
uridecanal Councils tackle the organization and the constitution of the
eat Church Societies which nominally supply the channel through which
e men and women, the boys and girls of the Church can find corporate
pression for their religious instincts. Most Modernists would feel that the
tivities and the constitutions of the M.U., the G.F.S., the C.E.M.S., the
P.C.K., the S.P.G. and C.M.S. might well undergo a radical change if
ey are to give expression to the religious instincts of the rising generation.
o quote Mr. Hardwick again, can anyone imagine that these Societies and
eir innumerable branches 'would welcome their invasion by a horde of
oral and religious free-thinkers? Can they absorb them and be invigorated
them?' I think the answer to that is not doubtful, and while such is
e case there is no hope for a serious revival of religion within the Church.
t the Church Assembly appoint a commission to go into this. It will be
ore helpful than that on Church and State.

C. H. D. GRIMES,
[*Adviser on Migration to the Church Army.*—ED., *M.C.*]

Bordeaux.

SOME OTHER THOUGHTS ON THE PROBLEM OF EVIL.

R,

The problem of evil and of pain can be looked at in various ways, for
stance, they seem to be a part of the mechanism of evolution. God has
t made the world, He is making it. 'It does not yet appear what we shall
.' but at least we are able to discern that a 'tendency which makes for
hteousness is the Will of God.' Mankind is in process of changing or
ng changed from a purely animal to some higher form of life, various
cies of animals, birds, fishes and insects have developed from individual-
n to a community life. The vision of the prophets of the lion lying down
h the lamb and of the cessation of war between men may perhaps be the
al of the future in the millions of years yet to come.

Pain is the consequence of any departure from the line of bodily improve-
nt or health not necessarily of the individual but of the race, a stimulus
keep on the right path. Similarly any failure to comply with the spiritual
mental improvement of the race brings evil or mental pain. A creature
s something which disagrees with it and suffers pain as a warning to
nge its diet, or contracts a disease which is inimical to the health of the
cies, and pain is again the warning to the species to avoid the cause of
h a complaint, warnings which have to be repeated when understanding

lags or the species may be wiped out. A man says or does something wrong and evil results, evil being a warning that such speech or action is against the good or the improvement of the community or race. Repeated failure to take the warning may cause the extinction of the individual or community.

It would follow from this that sin is failure to comply with the process of evolution, or, in other words, allowing man's animal nature to dominate his mental or spiritual. If we stray from the path which God would have us follow we must expect the warning pain or evil. How else should we know we have strayed? L.H.H.

SIR, DIVINITY IN CHURCH TRAINING COLLEGES.

I write to express my conviction of the importance of the second paragraph on page 159 of the Report of the Commission on Religious Education.

At present Divinity as studied in some of our Church Training Colleges has all the disadvantages of examination with none of its advantages.

Until Divinity is an examinable subject in the Final Certificate for Teachers, it will not occupy its proper place in the minds (nor indeed the hearts) of Training College Students, men for the most part poor and desperately anxious about their certificate results. You would have an exactly parallel situation if you could conceive of an undergraduate being compelled by authority to read a subject which he is not proposing to offer for his Schools. I find it difficult to pass on this view to those in high place, which must both explain and excuse this letter.

Now that Training Colleges are in close association with the Universities, and the University of London has demonstrated what expansion of theological study is possible on inter-denominational lines, the time seems opportune for this proposal of the Commission to be realised.

As it is, I am persuaded that the Archbishops' Examination in Religious Knowledge is regarded as a distraction, even by devout-minded students, from the main purpose of a Training College Student's life. Clearly this is not good in effect either upon the subject or the student.

Of course I need hardly say that even the most articulate students do not of their own volition express the point of view to which I have ventured to call your attention.

H. E. STEWART,
Chaplain and Tutor.

Culham College,
Abingdon, Berks.
March 17th, 1930.

SIR, MODERNISTS AND REUNION.

May I correct two misleading misprints in my letter in your March number? (1) 'The Modernist is *also* to simplify his belief' should read: 'The Modernist is *able* to simplify his belief.' (2) 'On a *broad* basis' should read: 'On a *broad enough* basis . . . to include Roman Catholics.' Though there is no prospect of Roman Catholics being willing to join a Federal Council, it ought to be broad enough to include them if they would join it. ARTHUR FLOYD.

Purley, Surrey.

SIR, BIBLE BOOKS FOR CHILDREN.

I have found Canon Woodward's *Jesus among the Children* (Hodder and Stoughton) a very good book for teaching children of from nine to fifteen. We even lend it to adults. L.C.R.-R.

Brinsley Vicarage, nr. Nottingham.

[The Editor regrets having to hold over correspondence.]